





L-101

STATE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION PROGRAM— INFORMATION CENTERS

HEARINGS BEFORE THE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS UNITED STATES SENATE EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS FIRST SESSION PURSUANT TO **S. Res. 40**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO EMPLOY TEMPORARY
ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL AND INCREASING THE LIMIT
OF EXPENDITURES

APRIL 29 AND MAY 5, 1953

PART 3

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1953

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota	JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Maine	CLYDE R. HOEY, North Carolina
HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Idaho	HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota
EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois	HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland	JOHN F. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan	STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri

WALTER L. REYNOLDS, *Chief Clerk*

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota	JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois	HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington
CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan	STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri

ROY M. COHN, *Chief Counsel*

FRANCIS D. FLANAGAN, *General Counsel and Staff Director*

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Index-----	I
Appendix-----	243
Testimony of—	
Epstein, Julius, New York, N. Y.	203
Kaghan, Theodore, Acting Deputy Director, Office of Public Affairs,	
United States High Commissioner, Germany-----	171, 221
Utley, Freda, Washington, D. C.-----	212

SCHEDULE OF EXHIBITS

	Introduced on page	Appears on page
10. Material from Die Neue Zeitung, February 15, 1946-----	210	(*)
11. Statement of Stefan Heym renouncing American citizenship and returning war medal-----	211	243
12. Report of State Department on book, Synchronoptische Weltgeschichte, by Arno and Anneliese Peters-----	218	(#)
13. Play, Unfinished Picture, by Theodore Kaghan-----	236	(*)
14. Material submitted by Theodore Kaghan-----	242	(*)

SUPPLEMENTAL DATA

1. Memorandum dated May 7, 1953, from House Committee on Un-American Activities to Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations-----	244
---	------------

* May be found in the files of the subcommittee.

Classified.



STATE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION PROGRAM INFORMATION CENTERS

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 1953

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON
INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE
ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,

Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met (pursuant to S. Res. 40, agreed to January 30, 1953) at 10:30 a. m., in room 357 of the Senate Office Building, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, chairman, presiding.

Present: Senators Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican, Wisconsin; Karl E. Mundt, Republican, South Dakota; John L. McClellan, Democrat, Arkansas; and Stuart Symington, Democrat, Missouri.

Present also: Roy M. Cohn, chief counsel; G. David Schine, chief consultant; Daniel G. Buckley, assistant counsel; Herbert Hawkins, investigator; Howard Rushmore, research director; and Ruth Young Watt, chief clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The hearing will come to order.

Mr. Theodore Kaghan! From the number of the cameras, Mr. Kaghan, you must be an important witness.

**TESTIMONY OF THEODORE KAGHAN, ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR,
OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS OF THE UNITED STATES HIGH
COMMISSIONER IN GERMANY**

Mr. KAGHAN. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Again let me remind the cameramen that they won't take any flash pictures while he is testifying.

Mr. Kaghan, you are reminded that you are still under oath. Will you give us your present title and job?

Mr. KAGHAN. Acting Deputy Director of the Office of Public Affairs of the United States High Commissioner in Germany.

The CHAIRMAN. And who is the Director?

Mr. KAGHAN. The Director is Alfred Boerner.

The CHAIRMAN. And while Mr. Boerner is absent you are, of course, the Acting Director; right?

Mr. KAGHAN. I am.

The CHAIRMAN. And this is the Office of Public Affairs. That is, in essence, an information office!

Mr. KAGHAN. I beg your pardon. I didn't hear you.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the Office of Public Affairs; that is, in essence, an information office!

Mr. KAGHAN. It is a lot more than information, sir. It works on America's political position in Europe and cooperates in psychological warfare against the Soviet Union and communism.

The CHAIRMAN. And in that department, I believe you told us that there are roughly 250 Americans and about 2,500 Germans. Is that right?

Mr. KAGHAN. Roughly; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kaghan, have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever attended Communist meetings?

Mr. KAGHAN. I believe I have, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you tell us roughly how many Communist meetings you have attended.

Mr. KAGHAN. I do not have any idea of the number of Communist meetings I may have attended. I attended various meetings in New York between the years of 1935 and 1940, and I am sure some of them must have been Communist-run, Communist-controlled or directed, and some of them were probably not. I went to all kinds of meetings. I was interested in what was going on.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you tell how many you attended that you knew were Communist meetings at the time you attended them?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; I can't give you a figure.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, would you say it was more than a dozen or less than a dozen? I am not speaking now of Communist meetings you accidentally attended, not knowing what they were. I am speaking of the meetings you attended knowing they were Communist meetings.

Mr. KAGHAN. I do not recall attending meetings that I knew were Communist Party meetings, that were identified as Communist Party meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, is it your testimony now that you did or did not know that some of those meetings were Communist meetings at the time you attended them?

Mr. KAGHAN. Roughly, I would say that I probably knew that some of them were Communist meetings. Now, whether they were party meetings or not, I didn't know, and I don't know now.

The CHAIRMAN. You lived at 310 West 47th Street for a while, did you not?

Mr. KAGHAN. I did.

The CHAIRMAN. In New York?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have Communist-cell meetings where you lived at 310 West 47th Street while you were living there?

Mr. KAGHAN. Not to my knowledge. I did not have any such meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. Not to your knowledge?

Mr. KAGHAN. I did not have any such meetings. That there were any more—it was not to my knowledge, as such.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was your roommate?

Mr. KAGHAN. Ben Irwin.

The CHAIRMAN. You knew Ben Irwin was a Communist at that time; did you not?

Mr. KAGHAN. I assumed he was.

The CHAIRMAN. And did Ben Irwin have meetings in your room at the time that you knew he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. KAGHAN. He did not have what were obviously meetings. He had people in. I never recognized them as meetings of an organization. They were people that came to see him, and there were groups there from time to time.

The CHAIRMAN. You knew he was a Communist. Were the men who attended these, call them what you may, meetings or gatherings, known to you also as members of the Communist Party?

Mr. KAGHAN. Sir, I did not say I knew he was a Communist. I assumed he was a Communist.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. When you assumed he was a Communist, did you know anybody else who attended those gatherings in your home that you also assumed were Communists?

Mr. KAGHAN. The place was not my home alone. It was also his. And I assumed that some of them probably were Communists. I wasn't afraid of Communists in those days. I didn't know the distinction between communism and political conspiracy.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kaghan, I am going to hand you a document which the reporter will refer to as exhibit No. 40.

(Exhibit No. 40 was previously introduced during the subcommittee's hearing on Voice of America on March 5, 1953.)

The CHAIRMAN. Will you identify your signature on that?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes; that is my signature.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that is your signature?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And the date of this is 1939.

May I read from it? It is entitled "Nominating Petition for Councilman":

I, the undersigned, do hereby state that I am a duly qualified voter of the borough for which a nomination for councilman is hereby made, and have registered as a voter within the said borough within the past 18 months; that my place of residence is truly stated opposite my signature hereto and that I intend to support at the ensuing election, and I do hereby nominate the following-named person as a candidate of the Communist Party * * *

Now, you state in this that you intend to support this Communist candidate.

Was that a correct statement at the time?

Mr. KAGHAN. I intended to support his attempt to get on the ballot.

I did not vote for him, and, as far as I can recall, I didn't do anything to help his election.

The CHAIRMAN. You say at that time you did not recognize the Communist Party as a danger to this country or the world?

Mr. KAGHAN. I did not. The Communist Party, to me, was a minority political movement which could never have any effect in the United States. I did not realize that communism was a political conspiracy until later.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time of the Hitler-Stalin pact, did you then perhaps recognize that communism might be a danger to the world?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't know whether I thought of it in terms of danger. I certainly distrusted it.

The CHAIRMAN. You distrusted?

Mr. KAGHAN. I distrusted the Soviet Union, and I distrusted people who believed that everything the Soviet Union did was right.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you distrust the Communist Party after the Hitler-Stalin pact?

Mr. KAGHAN. Definitely.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think you would sign a nominating petition after that time?

Mr. KAGHAN. I could have. I could have, because the purpose of a nominating petition is to get an American on a ballot where he can be voted against as well as for.

The CHAIRMAN. The purpose of the nominating petition for the Communist Party is to get a Communist on the ballot; is it not?

Mr. KAGHAN. To get a man on the ballot who has a political party; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And did you consider the Communists as a political party rather than a conspiracy?

Mr. KAGHAN. At that point, I considered the Communists, communism in America, as a political party.

The CHAIRMAN. And I call your attention to the fact that this was signed after the Hitler-Stalin pact. Are you aware of that?

Mr. KAGHAN. I take your word for it, sir. I don't recall the exact date.

The CHAIRMAN. I again call your attention to the following words:

* * * I intend to support * * * [this Communist candidate] * * * at the ensuing election.

Was that a correct statement at the time?

Mr. KAGHAN. I am not sure I read the top part of the petition. I don't know whether I read it or not. Because I did not support him.

The CHAIRMAN. Who asked you to sign this petition?

Mr. KAGHAN. I have no recollection of that, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you been solicited to join the Communist Party?

Mr. KAGHAN. Outrightly to join the party as such, I do not recall that I was, but I am sure I was being worked on toward that end.

The CHAIRMAN. Who do you think was working on you?

Mr. KAGHAN. Ben Irwin.

The CHAIRMAN. Name some others, will you?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't recall the names of others, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I might say, Mr. Kaghan, that your testimony follows pretty much a pattern.

You admit you lived with a Communist for a year. You worked, as you said the other day, for a Communist front, headed by a man you said you knew was a Communist. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir, I said I assumed he was a Communist. I didn't know he was a Communist.

The CHAIRMAN. You went to Communist meetings. Did you identify a single Communist other than Ben Irwin who has been exposed as one, well known as a Communist?

Mr. KAGHAN. I am sorry. I don't get the point on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, let me ask you the question: You have told us that you lived with a man whom you assumed was a Communist. You worked for an organization headed by a man whom you assumed was a Communist. You attended, you say, Communist meetings. You do not know how many. You testified there were gatherings in your home and the home of this Communist. My question is, now: Can

you name a single other individual who you assumed was a Communist at that time, attending those meetings or coming into your home?

Mr. KAGHAN. I cannot. I said yesterday, sir, that I assume the girl he married was a Communist. I don't remember her name.

The CHAIRMAN. A fairly safe assumption.

Mr. KAGHAN. A fairly safe assumption, possibly. I do not recall that there was any distinction between leftists and radicals and Communists which was obvious at that time. People didn't identify themselves as Communists, and a lot of people were running around with Communists who were not Communists, but who were being fooled by communism as much as I was, and who did not realize what was behind communism.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not the question, Mr. Kaghan. You have been picked by the Acheson regime to head the information program in Europe, to act as Deputy Director, and Acting Director, a great deal of the time, for the purpose of combating communism.

Now you tell us that you have reformed since 1939. Perhaps I should not say "reformed"; that you learned that communism was a menace since that time.

We could take that a lot more seriously if you could give us the name of just one individual, just one, outside of this well-known Communist, whom you were chumming with, whom you were working with, in 1939.

Mr. KAGHAN. I was not aware that he was a well-known Communist.

The CHAIRMAN. You were not aware of that?

Mr. KAGHAN. I was not aware that he was a well-known Communist.

The CHAIRMAN. A short time ago, two of my investigators, whom you referred to, I believe, as—

Mr. KAGHAN. Junketeering gumshoes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Contacted you in Germany.

At that time they asked you to name the Communists that you knew. And you said you would not name them, but you would name them before this committee.

I asked you that yesterday, and you said you did not know of any, except this Communist roommate, is that correct?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir. As I recall the testimony yesterday and the testimony in Germany, I said that I thought I knew of one Communist, but I did not want to name people outside of the immunity of this committee, and that I would be glad to name them at this committee. Which I did yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. "Name them," did you say?

Mr. KAGHAN. Him.

The CHAIRMAN. Your testimony today is, despite all this association, that you only know one other man that you assumed to be a Communist?

Mr. KAGHAN. There were other people, sir, who may have been Communists. I did not know whether they were Communists. The distinction was not drawn, and I think it would be very un-American to identify people who may have been just as much fooled as I was and just as much interested in the Communists as a minority movement. I do not recall the names of all the people I associated with in those days.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kaghan, it might be of some help to our FBI if you could give the names of those people who attended those gatherings, in the home of a man who you now say you assumed was a Communist.

Mr. KAGHAN. I feel very confident that I couldn't remember the name of anybody.

The CHAIRMAN. Not a single one?

Mr. KAGHAN. Not a single one. If I saw some names on a list, I might remember they were somebody I knew. I could not remember whether they were at the house or not.

The CHAIRMAN. You wrote a number of plays. Is that right?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, I did.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say they followed the Communist line?

Mr. KAGHAN. I would not say they followed the Communist line.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say they were acceptable to the Communists?

Mr. KAGHAN. I think they were, by and large, not necessarily in detail.

The CHAIRMAN. Not necessarily in detail. I have gone over a number of them, and I have had my staff read the others. I find that they seem to follow largely the same pattern, that you have someone representing the Communist Party, arguing the Communist line. You have someone very weakly arguing against it. In the end, you find the man against the Communist cause has been converted, in practically all the plays. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; I do not agree with the statement. You have made a dramatic judgment about whether the arguments against communism were weak. I doubt that they were weak. If they were weak, it wouldn't have been a good play.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me quote from one, if I may.

You recall the Unfinished Picture?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir; that is a play I wrote in the University of Michigan for which I got a \$1,000 prize. The University of Michigan is not a leftwing university.

The CHAIRMAN. What was that?

Mr. KAGHAN. I say the University of Michigan is not known to be a leftwing university.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not quite get the import of that. Does that mean that you could not have been leftwing or you could not have attended?

Mr. KAGHAN. I mean that the play would probably not have won a prize if it were a Communist play.

The CHAIRMAN. Who awarded this prize?

Mr. KAGHAN. The university itself. It was the Avery Hopwood award. I have forgotten the name of it. Drama, fiction, essay, and poetry.

I won several drama prizes, and that was the last year's prize.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kaghan, let me first refer to the Unfinished Picture, and read a few excerpts from it. Tell me whether you think this would be good anti-Communist propaganda or not. These are the words that you put in your actor's mouth. Page 22 of the Unfinished

Picture. Here is the language, the words, in one of your actor's mouth:

How can I enjoy life knowing there is so much misery?
What should I do, get married to some slave? On what?
It's just because I want to live that I am doing this?

talking about Communist activity.

I don't want to creep through life like a slave. I don't want to get married and bring up children to be more slaves. If my children can't be free, I don't want them to be born.

Would that be good anti-Communist propaganda?

Mr. KAGHAN. That sounds like a good American statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me read from page 24. See if this is a good American statement.

What is wrong with what we have got? You ought to thank God you have got it.

Answer:

Thank God? You ought to thank Morgan and Rockefeller for leaving you what they did if you want to thank anyone.

Julia, do you know what you are saying?

JULIA. Of course I know what I am saying. What do you expect me to do? Pray every night for God to let me go to college? I would rather write a letter to the President. At least that might get an answer.

Is that good anti-Communist propaganda?

Mr. KAGHAN. Sir, I would rather not discuss excerpts, lines read by you, from the play which I haven't read for years and haven't got a copy of handy. It depends on the rest of the play.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me read some more of the play.

Now, Gordon wouldn't have been shot if he hadn't been a Negro worker. There was no reason for his being shot except the cop didn't think his life was worth anything. It was purely a case of race discrimination of the worst type, equal to the lynching business going on in the South. The Communist Party is fighting militantly against that, and the mass funeral tomorrow is in protest against discrimination and the rising tide of fascism. * * *

The Communist Party wants to unite all workers in a struggle for their rights against a decadent system of capitalism. Gordon was a worker, and because he was a worker he was shot, like many other workers will be shot if they don't organize and put up a united front against their enemies, the capitalist class, which is rapidly becoming a Fascist regime. It's up to us to show our solidarity with all workers, and with minorities, like the Negroes.

Would you say that would be good anti-Communist propaganda?

Mr. KAGHAN. Sounds like a long-winded soapbox speech.

The CHAIRMAN. No, answer my question. Do you think that is either Communist propaganda or anti-Communist propaganda?

Mr. KAGHAN. That would probably be a Communist character speaking.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Let us read some more. He says:

I would like to add something. This isn't a race discrimination only. It is probably a capitalist attempt to split the ranks of the workers. We have to bear that in mind. It is important. If the white workers and the Negro workers get together, they have more power than they would otherwise. The bosses want to arouse antagonism between the whites and the Negroes so they won't get together and fight for their rights. That is why we are going to the funeral tomorrow. We have got to show our solidarity.

Would you say that is the Communist line or not?

Mr. KAGHAN. That would appear to be a Communist speaking. I assume it is a Communist speaking. But the intent of the play was, as I recall it, to show that communism was not a way out for America.

The CHAIRMAN. I hand you your own play, and ask you to read the concluding paragraphs, and tell us whether that does not end up with the Communist victorious. Is that not the end of all of your plays?

Mr. KAGHAN. I didn't hear your question.

The CHAIRMAN. Scan through the latter part of your play, and see if the conclusion is not a victory for the Communist argument.

Mr. KAGHAN. I can say it wasn't without scanning it, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, will you read the last several paragraphs?

Mr. KAGHAN. The part that is underlined in red?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, I think "red" is the right color. But you may read anything else. If what is in red is out of context, you read what explains it.

Mr. KAGHAN. I am not familiar with the full play, sir. I will read this part if you wish.

Alice says weakly :

Yes, go and lie down among my ruins. Smell the dust and ashes.

JULIA. Why don't you start burning the whole mess now, you and your Reds. Why do you leave me to look at the wreckage? Why don't you burn it? What are you waiting for?

GERTRUDE. There's not enough wreckage yet, my child. We have to wait.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you read that last line again?

Mr. KAGHAN (reading) :

There's not enough wreckage yet. We have to wait.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the end of the play?

Mr. KAGHAN. No; there is another line.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you read the next line?

Mr. KAGHAN (reading) :

FRANCES. Say, doesn't anyone want any supper tonight? (No one answers her, and Alice is looking up slowly to her as the curtain falls.)

The CHAIRMAN. Was that play produced by the Communists?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; it was produced at the University of Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. Which of your plays were produced by Communist organizations?

Mr. KAGHAN. As far as I know, the play about Spain was produced by the New Theater League, which I understand now is a Communist-front organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kaghan, perhaps you can help us out on this. You say that since 1939, at some time, you discovered that communism was a menace. Could you tell when you discovered it and what caused you to discover it?

Mr. KAGHAN. I discovered it was a menace to the world when I was in Austria, in Vienna, working for the United States Army as an information officer handling a newspaper, radio, news agency, and other mass media in Austria. I was working in the city of Vienna, which was full of Russians, Red Army, and Communists. This was in 1945 or 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, and 1950.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean it was in 1945 that you first began to discover that communism was a menace?

Mr. KAGHAN. In 1945, my suspicions that they were a serious problem and a menace were confirmed. I was suspicious about them long before that. I had no occasion to meet Russians and to work with Russians until I got to Vienna, which was occupied by the Russians.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the thing that causes, I think, a bit of confusion in the minds of some people is: What did you do outwardly to convince the people who hired you that you were the man to head this so-called anti-Communist drive?

You see, if they checked your background, all a matter of public record, they would find that you belonged to Communist fronts, that you roomed with a Communist, that you attended Communist meetings, that you signed a Communist nominating petition, and that up until 1939, even during the Russian-Hitler pact, you took part in signing a petition.

I am curious to know what you did outwardly at any time to convince them that you were a real anti-Communist.

Mr. KAGHAN. When I was brought to Germany for this job, I spent time working for the United States Army in Austria, using newspapers and other mass media to fight communism and to fight the Soviets, and I had such success fighting the Soviets that they printed cartoons about me, making fun of my newspaper. The Chancellor of Austria has written me a letter commenting on my anti-Soviet activities and anti-Communist activity. He says:

Through your very activities here in Austria—

this is Chancellor Figl speaking—

where we had to and still have to withstand strong Communist pressure, you placed yourself in line with the Austrian Federal Government. I remember clearly how you, courageously and in disregard of personal danger, faithfully took the side of the Austrian Government during the October revolution when the Communists in Austria wanted to seize power by force. Therefore, I really can't believe it, Mr. Kaghan, that people are seriously going to jump on you, and I felt I just had to tell you this, as an old friend, simply because I know you so well as a democrat and anti-Communist.

With cordial regards, I remain, as always, yours,

FIGL.

In another instance, the extreme rightist, Salzburger Nachrichten, which is so far right in Austria that the American Legation is a little concerned about it, came out with a front page editorial just a few weeks ago after Mr. Cohn and Mr. Schine had visited Austria, and among other things, they said:

If Mr. Kaghan is a Communist, then the Cardinals belong to the Mau Mau.

I have a copy of that if anybody wants it. I also have letters from General Keyes.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kaghan, your department was subsidizing this paper which you quoted, was it not?

Mr. KAGHAN. I beg your pardon, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Your department was subsidizing this paper from which you quoted?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Your agency?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir, this paper is not subsidized, so far as I know, by the United States Government. It is in Austria, sir. I have nothing to do with Austria now, and I don't believe we subsidized it then.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether any Government agency loaned them money?

Mr. KAGHAN. I do not know. I couldn't say. I am not in Austria, and I don't know what is going on there so far as press activities are concerned. This editorial was a surprise to me.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the name of this paper?

Mr. KAGHAN. Salzburger Nachrichten.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that when you were in Austria you were running a paper and you were actively fighting Communists?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. Would you mind stating the date or the time so that we can get it related?

Mr. KAGHAN. I got in Austria in 1945, sir, after the war. I was responsible for news operations there. I had a newspaper, a news agency, features, and pamphlets, or whatever else was printed for mass circulation. I don't know whether they were all there at the time. The paper was, but I had to organize a lot of the other stuff.

Senator McCLELLAN. May I ask you this: The letter that you referred to from a former Chancellor of Austria referred to the news aspect of the paper. Were you editor of the paper?

Mr. KAGHAN. I was editor of the paper. Not all the time. Sometimes I supervised the editor.

Senator McCLELLAN. I asked you yesterday if, as editor of the paper, you editorialized your opposition to communism, and I believed you answered that you did.

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. You stated at that time that you did not have copies of those editorials. Have you been able to procure them since?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir, I have not had time, but they are available in the State Department files here, in the papers, which have to be searched, because I didn't have editorials every day.

Senator McCLELLAN. Do you think you could supply them to the committee?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir; I think I could.

Senator McCLELLAN. Do you have any idea now as to the number that you did publish?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir, I don't have any idea as to the number.

Senator McCLELLAN. You think there is a substantial number. What I am trying to determine is: As far as I am concerned, Mr. Kaghan, your early background from my viewpoint is not something to be proud of. But I think there are Communists or those who were Communist sympathizers or those who were under some false illusion about communism, and so forth, that have subsequently definitely come to the conclusion that it is an international conspiracy and that it poses a great danger to the free world and now are just as much opposed to it as any other patriotic Americans. And what I am trying to determine is if you can document by editorials that you published in this paper, or by other acts or documentary evidence substantiate definitely the fact that you did change, and that therefore you used your talents and your position and your opportunity to fight communism. That is what I am interested in knowing.

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir. I can produce the editorials, and I can produce other statements, which were in the form of news statements which I helped prepare for General Keyes to make at the Allied Coun-

cil at various meetings attacking Soviet statements, so that they would be in the news. Fewer people read editorials than read news, so I managed to get my editorial ideas into the news that way. Some of those statements that General Keyes made—

The CHAIRMAN. What is that? You said you did your editorializing in the news columns?

Mr. KAGHAN. I got my editorial ideas across in the news columns by preparing statements for the High Commissioner to make against the Soviets in the Allied Council. I was one of several who helped the High Commissioner prepare his case against the Soviets every 2 weeks.

The CHAIRMAN. This is in 1946, you are talking about?

Mr. KAGHAN. From 1946 through 1950.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you know Col. Lawrence K. Ladue?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes; Col. Larry Ladue was my boss in the Information Services Branch, and he died in Korea.

The CHAIRMAN. You were asked about this yesterday, and I want to ask you again. Do you know that Ladue filed a report on you?

Mr. KAGHAN. You told me he did yesterday. That was the first I heard of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any idea what was in it?

Mr. KAGHAN. I have now; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he ever argue with you and tell you that you should not print the Tass dispatches?

Mr. KAGHAN. I believe he did.

The CHAIRMAN. And you insisted upon printing the Tass dispatches?

Mr. KAGHAN. I insisted on having the privilege to use my own judgment on how to use Russian Tass dispatches.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he argue with you that you should not play up cases of rape and lynching in the United States?

Mr. KAGHAN. He may have argued against playing it up, and I don't suppose I argued against playing it up. I was arguing for the right to print stories about trouble in the United States in the American newspaper our way, instead of leaving it to the Communists to print it their way.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he argue to you that you were playing up rapes and lynchings to the extent that you were giving the Communists a propaganda weapon? This was 1946.

Mr. KAGHAN. He may have said so. And I certainly would have argued that if the Communists were allowed to print these stories their way, and we did not print the true facts in the right perspective, the Communists would be one ahead of us. And I argued for the right to use my own judgment in printing news which was not the best kind of news coming out of America.

The CHAIRMAN. In any event, do you recall that he did urge you not to play up news about rapes and lynchings in the United States?

Mr. KAGHAN. I do not recall his urging me, but I would not argue that he didn't urge me not to play them up, and I would not have played them up anyhow.

The CHAIRMAN. At that time, was it rather difficult for an American to get an invitation to get into the Soviet Union?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't know whether it was or not. I never tried to get one.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know whether it was difficult in 1946 for an American to get an invitation to come into the Soviet Union?

Mr. KAGHAN. It is something I don't recall anything about.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you get such an invitation?

Mr. KAGHAN. You told me yesterday that I had.

The CHAIRMAN. I asked you whether you had.

Mr. KAGHAN. I beg your pardon?

The CHAIRMAN. I asked you whether you had.

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't recall that I had an official invitation to come to the Soviet Union.

The CHAIRMAN. An official invitation. Let us not play on words now. Did you get an invitation?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't recall that I got an invitation, but as I said yesterday, it is quite possible that in my contact with Soviet army people, the Soviet press people, on the Allied Council, somebody might have asked me how would I like to go to the Soviet Union.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kaghan, did you not inform Colonel Ladue that you had such an invitation and ask his permission to go to the Soviet Union?

Mr. KAGHAN. If I had such an invitation, I would certainly have reported it immediately to my superior officer, and if I did, if you say I did it, I suppose I did it.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know whether you did it. You were there. I was not.

Mr. KAGHAN. I do not recall the incident, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you tell us now that you do not remember? It would seem to me that would be a rather important invitation.

Mr. KAGHAN. Not when you are associating with Red army officers every week in Allied Council meetings, or every other week.

The CHAIRMAN. You would say it was the usual thing to get an invitation to come to Russia?

Mr. KAGHAN. I would not say it was the usual thing, no, sir; but if you are standing around with these officers in an Allied Council meeting, and somebody says, "Why don't you come to Russia sometime, and you will see everything you are writing about is a lie," I would consider that an offhand invitation to come to the Soviet Union, but not an official one.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that some Red army officer would have a right to invite someone to the Soviet Union on his own?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't know. I doubt it. But he might say, "Why don't you come to the Soviet Union and see for yourself that you are lying about the Soviet Union?" And if he ever said that, something might happen to him. I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Mundt?

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue with the witness a little further, in his own interests and in the interests of the country and the Congress, what, if anything, transpired between 1939 and 1946 which would be persuasive evidence to those who employed him that he had a change of mind.

If I recall your testimony correctly, Mr. Kaghan, prior to 1939, over a period of just how many years I do not know, you had had numerous associations, according to your own testimony, with communism and with Communists. That is, you had roomed with a

Communist. You had signed a petition promising to support a Communist candidate. You had written plays which Communists had produced. I think you testified yesterday that you, in fact, belonged to a theater group which was more or less dedicated to the production of leftwing and Socialist and Communist plays.

And in 1946 we find you in Austria publishing a newspaper, writing editorials, which you tell us you are going to bring in, of an anti-Communist nature. I can understand that people have changes of attitude. But what I am interested in is what evidence you produced to your employers in 1939 or 1939½ or 1940 which convinced them that a man who had had these open and covert associations with communism up to that time was a safe security risk to send to Austria or to put in the Government service. Now, if you could help us supply that gap, if you could provide that evidence, it will be very helpful.

Mr. KAGHAN. In 1939 I went to work on the foreign desk of the New York Herald Tribune. There was a lot of war news—

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt there? Did Joe Barnes get that job for you?

Mr. KAGHAN. I do not know that he did, sir. I saw the editor. I didn't see Joe Barnes when I went in there.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know Joe Barnes?

Mr. KAGHAN. I do know Joe Barnes. I did know Joe Barnes.

The CHAIRMAN. And you say he did not help you get the job?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't know whether he said anything about me or not. I didn't know him before that.

The CHAIRMAN. You do know that he has been named a number of times under oath as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. KAGHAN. You told me that yesterday, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you not know that?

Mr. KAGHAN. That he had been named under oath as a member of the Communist Party? I don't recall that I knew that.

The CHAIRMAN. You were on the foreign desk when Barnes was your supervisor?

Mr. KAGHAN. He was chief of the foreign department, not my supervisor. He was up above me, but not my supervisor.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you know Barnes was a Communist at that time?

Mr. KAGHAN. I did not know Barnes was a Communist.

Senator MUNDT. In 1939—am I right about the year?—you were living with Mr. Irwin, the man you have described as a Communist.

Mr. KAGHAN. I think that is right.

Senator MUNDT. What I am trying to find out is, What transpired between that date and the time when you went to work for the Government in a security capacity, or an important capacity in a security area, which would be convincing evidence to your Government employers that you had had a change of heart or a change of attitude?

Mr. KAGHAN. I was working on the foreign desk and handled a lot of war news, including the Finnish war news, and I was strongly persuaded that the Russians were not doing the right thing in Finland. I edited that kind of news, and I did not participate, as far as I can recall, in any Communist activities. I was busy working, and I wasn't particularly interested in the Communists at that time.

And when I joined the Government, in 1942, I talked to people, who I believe were the FBI, about these things, about the signing of this petition, and about my plays. I don't know the date that I talked to the FBI, but I do recall explaining to the FBI way back then in the forties, about this petition and about my play.

Senator MUNDT. Was that before, or after, you were employed by the Government?

Mr. KAGHAN. It was probably after.

Senator MUNDT. You see, what I am trying to find out is what happened openly between 1939 or the years immediately preceding and the time you got your first Government job, which would convince your Government employers that these associations you had had with the Communists no longer reflected your point of view.

Mr. KAGHAN. I was working very satisfactorily, as far as I know, on a staunchly Republican newspaper, which had no reason to doubt the fact that I was handling news.

The CHAIRMAN. What was this staunchly Republican newspaper?

Mr. KAGHAN. The New York Herald-Tribune. And I was not involved in anything. It was negative, sir. I am sorry I can't show you a speech I made or any violent action I took against communism. I just phased away from the associations I had had. And I worked on the newspaper and moved from there into the Office of War Information, where I was hired by Edward Barrett.

Senator MUNDT. Who was that?

Mr. KAGHAN. I was interviewed by Edward Barrett, who persuaded me to come into the Office of War Information. And I emphasize "persuaded."

Senator MUNDT. You see, one of the purposes of this whole investigation is to determine whether the screening process by which people presently employed in the Government have been cleared was adequate to eliminate security risks. Without in any way raising the question insofar as you are concerned, you are a good laboratory exhibit to determine whether that screening process was adequate because, by your own testimony, you have revealed and recorded a long series of Communist associations which naturally would raise some suspicions in the mind of any Government employer who took the trouble to make an investigation unless there was subsequent evidence indicating that you had openly changed. Now, I think you testified yesterday that while you worked on the Herald Tribune you did not write byline stories. So, regardless of how you wrote about Finland and regardless of the fact that your suspicions about the evils of communism began to grow in your mind at that time, I am trying to find some evidence which would eliminate the suspicions which must have started to grow in the minds of your potential employers when they discovered this long list of Communist associations. Now, is it the best of your recollection that you did nothing openly, that you did nothing which future employers could look to to satisfy themselves that there had been a change in your attitude?

Mr. KAGHAN. No overt act, except moving away from the associations and the activities.

Senator MUNDT. Which was not an overt act.

Mr. KAGHAN. It was not an overt act. I may have made an overt act. I don't recall any. I was too busy working and enjoying my job to get involved in any arguments of that kind.

Senator MUNDT. Let me ask you some specific questions. You have written plays which were pro-Communist. Did you write any plays which were anti-Communist?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; I didn't write any plays that got anywhere.

Senator MUNDT. You attended Communist meetings. Had you associated yourself with any anti-Communist association?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir.

Senator MUNDT. Did you do as Elizabeth Bentley and Whittaker Chambers did and go to the FBI saying, "I got in with a bad outfit. I know these people. I think they may be dangerous?"

Mr. KAGHAN. I am not aware of when they did that. I am not aware it was in those years.

Senator MUNDT. I am not saying it was in those years, but they did do that.

Mr. KAGHAN. When they were doing that, I was doing another type of fighting communism, with a newspaper in the heart of Europe, surrounded by the Red army. They did it their way, and I did it my way.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Chambers did it in 1939, when you were still working for the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. KAGHAN. The New York Herald Tribune.

I will grant you some people found out sooner than I did and did something about it. But I did something about it.

Senator MUNDT. I am not questioning your motives, or when you found out. I am questioning the devices, what appears to be the complete laxity on the part of the Government, because of the fact that they hired you without any evidence of any kind that you had changed. Now, assuming that you did change, they did not make any attempt to find out, apparently, either that you used to belong to these organizations, or that you had changed. That is what I am saying. According to your testimony, there was a complete laxity on the part of those who hired you, the OWI, or whoever it was. Either they made no investigation or, having made an investigation, they didn't care about the fact that you had had these associations. Is that right?

Mr. KAGHAN. That is more or less correct, sir. There was a war emergency, and they needed people quickly, and fast, and they hired as fast as they could to do the work they had to do in psychological warfare.

Senator MUNDT. When you first openly opposed communism, in a way that the name of Kaghan might be associated with anti-Communist causes, I think you testified that was in Austria in about 1946. Is that right?

Mr. KAGHAN. That is right. That is when Kaghan's name was associated with anticomunism. Before that, he was just developing and working in the Office of War Information as a Government employee who was handling war news and was not involved in pro- or anti-Communist activities.

Senator MUNDT. I know the individual whose name you give as reference. I met him in Austria and have a high regard for him, but I think the editorials you can submit are more important because good people have been fooled in this business for a long time. I recall that Justice Frankfurter testified for Alger Hiss in public

court. He thought he was a good, reputable citizen. So did Justice Reed. But the fact still remains that Alger Hiss was a traitor.

So we would like to get this evidence which you are going to supply from your own records which you will have to agree is more authoritative and more persuasive than the fact that a good man says what he has.

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. If you were doing the hiring, and your job was to head up this Public Affairs Section that proposed to fight communism, would you hire a man with your background, with Communist associations?

Mr. KAGHAN. That would depend on what the man had done since then.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, if, as you say, he was guilty of no overt act to show that he had really broken with the party, or not with the party but with the line, would you hire him?

Mr. KAGHAN. I wouldn't be in a position to know, sir. If I wanted to hire a man, I would have to have him checked through the FBI and give him security clearance.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kaghian, you know that the FBI does not give security clearances. The FBI develops the information. It is up to the hiring agency to either refuse or to give security clearance. You know that, do you not?

Mr. KAGHAN. I know that now, sir. But I would have to depend upon the hiring agency to have him checked by the FBI.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us assume you were the hiring agency. Let us assume the FBI has checked. Let us assume the FBI has found all the facts Senator Mundt has recited, about living with a Communist, writing Communist-line plays, having them produced by Communist organizations. Let us assume the FBI laid all that on your desk. In addition to that, let us say they said, "Now, we do not find any overt act on the part of this man to show that he has ever broken with that line of thinking." Would you then hire him to head up this information program?

Mr. KAGHAN. If there was no evidence to prove he had ever broken with that line of thinking, I certainly would not.

The CHAIRMAN. You would not?

Mr. KAGHAN. I would not.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not want to belabor the point, but if you want to, you can now give us the evidence of your having broken with that line of thinking. So far you have not.

Mr. KAGHAN. I believe I have, sir, with all the things I have cited, and the fact that I moved away from these past associations and worked in the Office of War Information and did not participate in any Communist operations or activities, and that in Austria I fought the Communists and the Soviets. I think that is ample proof that I changed my mind about any good that communism could do anybody anywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, now, you say you fought the Communists in Austria. Did not your superior, Colonel Ladue, tell you that you were too friendly toward the Communist cause?

Mr. KAGHAN. He may have told me that I was friendly. I don't recall his ever saying that I was friendly toward the Communist cause, no.

The CHAIRMAN. Can we say this: That your superior, Colonel Ladue, indicated to you that he felt you were not adequately fighting communism?

Mr. KAGHAN. I do not recall that he did, in those terms. I am sure we must have had some discussions about how to fight communism, and I am sure I probably disagreed with him on the handling of news, because I was a newspaperman, and he was not.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us go back to some of this fighting of communism as of today. Is it correct, as you told us yesterday, that my two investigators, who were in Germany, found that one of the men in your department who was lecturing in Germany was, in your opinion, a Communist?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir. I didn't know anything about the man until a couple of days ago.

The CHAIRMAN. You know now that your lecturer over there is a Communist?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; I have no opinion on him. I don't know anything about him, except that he is said to have said something favorable about Malenkov. I don't know what he said. I don't know whether he is a Communist. I don't know the man. He is a German. He lectures in the America Haus. And I never met him.

The CHAIRMAN. You told us yesterday you were in a discussion as to whether this man should be discontinued as a lecturer. Was it brought to your attention that he had said that Malenkov was peace-loving, that if war came it would be our fault, that they should adopt in Germany the educational system that the Russians had adopted? Was that brought to your attention?

Mr. KAGHAN. I had heard something about that. I heard just about that much. And I also overheard a conversation saying if that was the case, he should be taken off the lecture circuit. I don't know whether it was the case. I don't know who reported it. I don't know whether the man said it.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you not check into that?

Mr. KAGHAN. I didn't have time, and it wasn't reported to me. It was reported to Mr. Boerner, who was running the Office of Public Affairs, and he has checked into it. And what he has done, I do not know at this point.

Senator McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire?

Was this lecturer under your supervision? Did you employ him? In other words, do you have responsibility for him?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir. I would have responsibility for anything that went on in the Office of Public Affairs while I was in charge. If one of the subordinates hired somebody who was a Communist, in the last analysis the top man is responsible for the bad judgment of the man under him.

Senator McCLELLAN. What I am trying to determine now: Apparently this is a recent occurrence.

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. When it came to your attention, was it your responsibility to investigate and take appropriate action?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; it was not.

Senator McCLELLAN. Whose responsibility was it?

Mr. KAGHAN. It was the responsibility immediately of the Public Affairs officer in Munich, in Bavaria.

Senator McCLELLAN. Is he under your jurisdiction?

Mr. KAGHAN. He is under the jurisdiction of the Director.

Senator McCLELLAN. Not under yours?

Mr. KAGHAN. Not directly; no. They are under the direct responsibility of the Office of Public Affairs. When he is there, people, Public Affairs officers, report to him, not to me.

Senator McCLELLAN. When did this come to your attention?

Mr. KAGHAN. Just last week.

Senator McCLELLAN. Last week?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir; last week.

Senator McCLELLAN. While you were still in Germany?

Mr. KAGHAN. While I was still in Germany preparing to come here.

Senator McCLELLAN. Had you had opportunity or time to make an investigation or discharge your responsibility before you left Bavaria?

Mr. KAGHAN. I did not have time, sir, but an investigation was under way before I left.

Senator McCLELLAN. An investigation was under way?

Mr. KAGHAN. Was under way.

Senator McCLELLAN. And you do not know the outcome of it?

Mr. KAGHAN. I heard the Director of the Office of Public Affairs advise the public affairs officer in Munich to take the men off the circuit until we could find out what the score was.

Senator McCLELLAN. In other words, peremptory action was taken to remove him?

Mr. KAGHAN. Action was taken immediately to find out what the facts were.

Senator McCLELLAN. I am trying to determine what responsibility you had with respect to it and what action you took, if any.

Mr. KAGHAN. That particular one was not my direct responsibility. I would have taken action if Boerner had not been there.

The CHAIRMAN. May I call to your attention, Senator, that Mr. Clucas—he is the public affairs officer, is he not?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to point out that he was case No. 26 on a list I gave to the Tydings committee. We have here the statement of Irwin von Bressendorf. Do you know Irwin von Bressendorf?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't think so.

The CHAIRMAN. In it he sets forth that when this man was lecturing he was urging that the educational system under the Soviets is so progressive that it should be used as a pattern in western countries, that he knew Malenkov personally as being a peace lover, and that he would not go to war unless challenged. After that was brought to the attention of Mr. Clucas, counsel, this lecturer, Mr. J. E. Eckstein, gave how many additional lectures?

Mr. COHN. He gave nine additional lectures.

Mr. KAGHAN. No; I did not know that until yesterday when you told me.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say if Mr. Clucas is the man responsible, and he kept this man on, after he had lectured to this effect, Mr. Clucas should be removed?

Mr. KAGHAN. If Mr. Clucas knew that this man was giving Communist lectures, he would have stopped him. I am sure he was trying to get what the man did say and compare it to the report.

The CHAIRMAN. You think Mr. Clucas is a competent official?

Mr. KAGHAN. One of the most competent officials we have.

The CHAIRMAN. He fully meets with your approval?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kaghan, if you do go back in your job, will you get for us the report of the monitoring of Mr. Eckstein's talks? I understand that this particular talk was monitored by the public affairs officer from HICOG, and he gave your department a report to the effect that it was adverse to American policy.

Mr. KAGHAN. If the report was monitored, sir, and I can find such a report, I will certainly send it through the Department to the committee, if I go back to Germany.

The CHAIRMAN. I may say that counsel advises me that this is a report received from the State Department to the effect that a public affairs officer from HICOG had monitored this man's talk, gave you a report, gave your department a report, that it was adverse to American policy, and that subsequent thereto this man gave 8 or 9 lectures.

Let me ask you another question: When you are Acting Director, you have responsibility, of course, over the libraries in that section?

Mr. KAGHAN. When I am Acting Director, I have responsibility for libraries and everything else; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How about when you are Acting Deputy Director?

Mr. KAGHAN. I do not have direct operating responsibility; no, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You have?

Mr. KAGHAN. I do not have. I assist the Director in running the office.

The CHAIRMAN. One of your responsibilities is supervising the entire information program, including the libraries?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, do I understand that since Secretary Dulles issued the new order, you have been removing books by Communist authors from the shelves of the libraries?

Mr. KAGHAN. We have been removing the books that the Department has advised us to remove, by author.

The CHAIRMAN. And they have been giving you a list of the authors by name?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, they have.

The CHAIRMAN. And you do not have a blanket order to remove the works of all known Communist authors?

Mr. KAGHAN. We had a blanket order of that kind, that famous "et cetera" order, and I think it has since been clarified, and specific names of authors are being supplied as they are found out, as they find we have such books.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you, on your own, ordered the removal of the works of all known Communist authors, or have you ordered the removal of only those authors named by the State Department?

Mr. KAGHAN. It would be my responsibility to follow the orders of the State Department in that. I would not give an order to remove any books of that kind at such a time without instructions from the Department.

The CHAIRMAN. Even though you knew other known Communist authors' works were on the shelves, you would not order their removal?

Mr. KAGHAN. If I knew there were other Communist authors' works on the shelves, I would probably order their removal, but I was not aware of the list of people on the shelves.

The CHAIRMAN. So that we have this picture completely clear, I assume it is agreed that the public affairs officer, a man in your position, should have available the works of Communists, so that you can tell what they are doing, what they are thinking, and can have enough knowledge so that you can fight communism. And we are speaking about these books on the shelves. We are speaking about books not on the shelves of some private library for the public affairs officers, but books for the general public of Germany. Is that right?

Mr. KAGHAN. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. So these Communist books are not books merely for your benefit or something for men allegedly fighting communism. They were available for the German people in our libraries with our approval.

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, they were.

The CHAIRMAN. And you say you have taken the works of how many authors off the shelves?

Mr. KAGHAN. When I left there were 4 or 5 authors off. They may be more now. Possibly half a dozen before I left. When I directed someone to take them off, that order would go to the man in charge of the American Houses, who was in charge of the libraries, and he would remove the books.

The CHAIRMAN. Yesterday, you said there were a dozen different authors. You did not know how many books.

Mr. KAGHAN. I said it could be a dozen different authors by this time. I am not sure it is that many. It is as many as the Department ordered us to take off.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know how many books?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; I would not have statistics on it.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say it was proper, or improper, to have those books by Communist authors on your information shelves?

Mr. KAGHAN. Known Communist authors, I do not think should be on our shelves; no.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever check to find out whether they were?

Mr. KAGHAN. No; I did not, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You did not. Did you not have any interest in that?

Mr. KAGHAN. I would have had interest if the subject had come up, and I did have interest as soon as it did come up.

The CHAIRMAN. You are spending about \$61 million a year, are you not?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't have the budget figures, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that roughly, the right figure?

Mr. KAGHAN. I am sorry. I do have the budget figures. In 1952, we spent—

The CHAIRMAN. \$62 million?

Mr. KAGHAN. \$61 million, I think it is.

The CHAIRMAN. \$61 million. I assume considerable of that was for the purchase of books, books to fight communism, if you please, to demonstrate America's way of life as compared to the Communist way of life. Was that the purpose of buying those books?

Mr. KAGHAN. The purpose of supplying books from the United States about the United States is to explain the American way of life and the American philosophy and the American position on various matters; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand you never even checked, never concerned yourself with the kind of books that you were purchasing?

Mr. KAGHAN. There is a department, a division, that handles the purchase of books and the supplying of books. I couldn't possibly handle it or know what books they were buying.

The CHAIRMAN. You could not know?

Mr. KAGHAN. I would not be spending any time in that department. That is somebody else's department. The books are purchased by Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there not men working under you?

Mr. KAGHAN. The man running libraries works under me, but he does not purchase the books. They are purchased in Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. You say it was not your job to purchase the books?

Mr. KAGHAN. Not directly; no.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it not your job to see that you had a good information program?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes; it is my job to have as good an information and psychological warfare library as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand that no books were purchased from the \$61 million, that they were all purchased in Washington?

Mr. KAGHAN. No; there are occasionally books purchased in Germany.

The CHAIRMAN. You have also translated books into German?

Mr. KAGHAN. We have translated books into German.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether you translated any Communist books into German?

Mr. KAGHAN. No; I do not think we have translated any Communist books into German.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know? Do you know whether you have or have not translated books by known Communist authors into German?

Mr. KAGHAN. I do not believe we have, sir. I have not read all the books that were translated, and I am pretty sure the policy would be against translating books of Communists. Where they were former Communists is another matter. Sometimes former Communists are very good anti-Communist fighters, and we may have used some of their books, after they became anti-Communist.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Kaghan, you very vigorously objected to our two investigators who were over in your area checking on the books in your libraries in your information program. I gathered from your public statements that you thought they had done something radically wrong. I think the committee would be interested in hearing of any improper activities on the part of the two "junketeering gumshoes." Would you like to tell us what they did which you considered improper?

Mr. KAGHAN. It was my opinion that they had come over on a very serious business and that they were investigating communism, which I think is a very legitimate operation for the Senate. And we were prepared on Easter Monday to give them a complete picture

of what we were doing in Germany about the problem. They did not come to this briefing that we had prepared. They showed up late, and I discovered or was told that they did not want to see me, even though my name had been bandied about at this committee, and that they were not going to see me.

The CHAIRMAN. The first question they asked you, you refused to answer, did you not?

Mr. KAGHAN. The first question they asked me, I said I would answer here. I said the FBI had all the records on that.

The CHAIRMAN. You refused to answer, did you not?

Mr. KAGHAN. At first I hesitated to answer to two young men whom I knew did not have any immunity, and I was a little bit concerned about the fact that they had not wanted to see me and be briefed on Germany in the morning when we were ready for them and waited for them all day.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the reason you refused in the afternoon to answer the first question about your Communist activities was that, No. 1, they came late, in the afternoon, instead of the morning, and No. 2, you said there was no immunity. I did not understand that.

Mr. KAGHAN. I was not prepared to answer questions of that nature, at first, when I walked in there. And I did answer the question, after my first remark, that I would answer it here, or that the FBI had the facts. I then answered the question and told them the full story.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. So the first objection is that they came in the afternoon instead of in the morning.

Senator MUNDT. Let me get that part clear. Had they made an appointment with you in the morning, which they failed to keep?

Mr. KAGHAN. Not exactly, sir. They were met by one of my men the night before, who told them that the Office of Public Affairs would be ready to brief them on the operations of the Information Department there in the morning, which was a holiday. We were all there to brief them. We expected that they would come. They did not say they would not come.

Senator MUNDT. Did they say they would come?

Mr. KAGHAN. I am not aware that they did.

Senator MUNDT. After all, if a couple of investigators are around investigating your shop, I would not think that you would take any offense because you could not determine where they were going to meet and what you were going to talk about.

That would be their business; would it not?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir. I took no offense at that.

Senator MUNDT. I do not think the fact that they saw you in the afternoon instead of in the morning is any very justifiable position for any attitude you might take, because it was up to them to determine when to talk to you, if at all, since, after all, part of their job was to investigate what was being done in your shop. That is why they went there.

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes. It was our impression they wanted to know what we were doing in the field, and I had all the people there to tell them.

Senator MUNDT. But it is entirely conceivable that they might want to find out from other sources than those selected by you?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir; it certainly is.

Senator MUNDT. So there could be no courtesy, and no offense. That they did not decide to conduct the investigation according to your pattern should not in any way upset you.

Mr. KAGHAN. I must admit that I resented the way they went about it.

Senator MUNDT. Well, maybe you resented the whole investigation.

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; I welcomed the investigation. We had everybody there, with all the charts and all the information to tell them all about it.

Senator MUNDT. It is not a very good way to conduct an investigation, if I may say so, to go to the people you are investigating and say, "Now tell us the story." So you tell them, and they come back home and say, "We know all about it."

Mr. KAGHAN. You are right, sir.

Senator MUNDT. That is not the way I would want our investigations run. Then, indeed, they would be gumshoes.

Mr. KAGHAN. But I didn't think they were coming over as investigators to investigate. I thought they were coming over to find out about how the program operated. And the fact that I was involved in these hearings, that my name had been mentioned, gave me somewhat of a personal interest in their activities.

Senator MUNDT. Naturally. And I think it was very fine that they did come and talk to you. I think you should appreciate that, because it is entirely possible that a great and good investigation could have been conducted without ever talking to you at all.

Mr. KAGHAN. It certainly is, sir.

Senator MUNDT. But they did talk to you?

Mr. KAGHAN. They did talk to me after the American press in Bonn persuaded them to, by their own admission.

Senator MUNDT. They persuaded them sometime in the morning of that day?

Mr. KAGHAN. They had a press conference at 3 o'clock in the afternoon of that day, and they said they would not talk to me, and during the press conference they said, "You guys have convinced us that we probably ought to talk to them." And they did.

The CHAIRMAN. I may say, and I think you know it, Mr. Kagan, that when a man is being investigated, especially a man with the type of background that you have, the logical thing would be for them not to go to you and just take your story. Their job was to get over and get the facts. You say you knew about all the facts before they came. You said yesterday you did not know about this lecturer until they uncovered it.

Mr. KAGHAN. I didn't know about the lecturer until it was uncovered last week.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not think it is rather important?

Mr. KAGHAN. I think it is important to uncover Communists in our information program, absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not think it is rather unusual that when you have some 2,800 people working for you, we should have to send 2 "gumshoeing junketeers" over there to find out about this lecturer?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't know the man is a Communist. He has been denounced as one. Maybe he is, and maybe he is not. I don't know what the man was saying or what the story is.

Senator MUNDT. Did you not testify that you knew he was talking in favor of Malenkov and the Russian position?

Mr. KAGHAN. Sir, I testified that I had heard that he had said something in favor of Malenkov.

Senator MUNDT. The point is not whether he is a Communist or not. The point is whether he is talking in favor of the Communists. That is the point; is it not?

Mr. KAGHAN. Absolutely, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kaghan, is it true that HICOG had a man follow my investigators at all times in Europe and report by phone to your office?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; it is not true.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not true?

Mr. KAGHAN. They had an escort officer provided all VIP's. I don't think he followed them except respectfully.

The CHAIRMAN. You say you call him an escort officer?

Mr. KAGHAN. An escort officer; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Just for the record, Mr. Cohn, you informed the officials over there that you wanted no State Department official with you, that you were doing your own investigating; is that right?

Mr. COHN. That is right, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. So that this escort you are talking about did follow the two men? Is that right?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; I don't believe he followed the two men. I did not know anything about their not wanting an escort officer. I do not believe he followed them. And the men didn't work for me, anyhow.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, do you know Mr. Slocum?

Mr. KAGHAN. I know Mr. Slocum; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did Mr. Slocum work for you?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, he does work for me. John Slocum.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his title?

Mr. KAGHAN. He is Chief of the Public Liaison Branch.

The CHAIRMAN. And what is the name of this escort officer you talked about?

Mr. KAGHAN. Monteconi.

The CHAIRMAN. Pardon?

Mr. KAGHAN. His name is Monteconi.

The CHAIRMAN. And he works—

Mr. KAGHAN. He works for the Executive Director's office.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you spell that?

Mr. KAGHAN. Monteconi, M-o-n-t, I think it is, e-c-o-n-i.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, did Mr. Slocum tell you that he got periodic reports from this man Monte—whatever you call him?

Mr. KAGHAN. Monteconi; "Monte" is what we call him.

The CHAIRMAN. Did Mr. Slocum tell you that he was getting long-distance reports on the activities of Mr. Cohn and Mr. Schine?

Mr. KAGHAN. Mr. Slocum didn't tell me he was getting long-distance reports, sir. He occasionally said he had ascertained something from Monteconi; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he report to you each day?

Mr. KAGHAN. I assume he did, during the period of their presence in Germany.

The CHAIRMAN. And did he tell you whom Mr. Cohn and Mr. Schine had interviewed? where they had lunch? what time they ate?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; he did not.

The CHAIRMAN. What did he tell you about, then?

Mr. KAGHAN. Mr. Slocum?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. KAGHAN. Mr. Slocum did no more than tell me where they were, as far as I can recall.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you think that was a proper expenditure of public funds to hire someone to tail two committee investigators? pay for his expenses while he was following them? pay for his long-distance phone calls for reporting in? Do you think that was a proper expenditure of public funds?

Mr. KAGHAN. I couldn't say, sir. The escort officer did not belong to my office at all. He was an escort officer who was available to take care of the needs of VIP's who come over there and want to know what is going on and need some assistance. And I believe he was there to assist them.

Senator MUNDT. Let me inquire: Is it a practice over there to attach a so-called escort officer to all official American visitors whether they want him or not?

Mr. KAGHAN. Not to my knowledge. I believe that is done only if they are wanted.

Senator MUNDT. Did you request that that be done, Counsel?

Mr. COHN. We requested it so much, Senator Mundt, that after this escort officer would keep walking in and discovering the identity of every confidential informant we were talking to, we made a formal protest to the Acting High Commissioner of Germany, and asked that this man be taken away immediately, because it was impossible to continue our work as a result of the exposure of the names of witnesses we were seeing, the printing of questions we asked them in the newspapers the next day, and various things along those lines. So I think it could hardly be said that he was of assistance to us.

Senator MUNDT. I am not trying to assume that you were responsible for that because it was done, as I understand it, under the orders of somebody else. Who did request this escort officer; do you know?

Mr. KAGHAN. I assumed that Mr. Wolfe, who was the executive director, assigned him to Mr. Cohn and Mr. Schine.

Senator MUNDT. It just occurs to me that HICOG had been living so close to Moscow for so long that they have adopted some of the Moscow practices because when I was in Russia, I had an escort officer assigned to me that I did not want, but I could not get rid of him.

Mr. KAGHAN. I am sure, sir, if you came to Germany and you said you did not want an escort officer you would not have one.

Senator MUNDT. Should not that same thing hold true for official committee investigators?

Mr. KAGHAN. I should think so.

Senator MUNDT. I would, too.

The CHAIRMAN. Yesterday you told us that one of the reasons why you had this tail put on our investigators was so that you could let the press know where they were at all times. Is that still your story, as one of the reasons?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir, if I could put those in the words I think I used, Mr. Slocum's business is to assist the American and the German

and foreign press in Austria—or in Germany—to get information about the United States operation in Germany. And when two investigators come over, the American press is interested in who they are, what they are, where they are going, and so on. Mr. Slocum does his best to protect the interests of the United States and serve the interests of the American press. And his interest was to be able to answer questions about Mr. Cohn and Mr. Schine insofar as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, it is true that Mr. Slocum wanted this information as to where they were going and what they were doing so that he could keep the press informed. Is that correct?

Mr. KAGHAN. He would want to know their schedule, so that he could keep the press informed.

The CHAIRMAN. I may say that we have a number of investigators on the committee. How many is it? Twelve or thirteen? And they travel all over the United States. And we do not have any Government department tailing them, as far as we know. In other words, the State Department does not tail our investigators in this country. It seems very unusual that you would feel justified in spending public money to put a tail on our investigators so that you would know where they were at all times. It is interesting, to say the least.

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't believe we put a tail on them, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. An unwanted escort?

Mr. KAGHAN. As I said yesterday, investigators in this country probably don't get reported on, but they probably don't give press conferences every time they get off and on a plane.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that you should censor our investigators, tell them when they should talk to the press?

Mr. KAGHAN. Sir, I do not think I should say when they should talk to the press, but my responsibility in Germany is to keep the prestige of the United States Government and the United States Senate as high and as clean as possible, and when two young men come over and make that difficult and cast reflections on the United States Senate and on the United States, I take a personal interest.

Senator MUNDT. In other words, it is possible, Mr. Kaghān, that the fact Mr. Slocum was notifying the European press every place they were going to go made it easier for them to hold press conferences.

Mr. KAGHAN. Sir, I think it was unnecessary for Mr. Slocum to notify anybody where they were going to go.

Senator MUNDT. Were you contributing to what you were considering an evil, that is, these press conferences, by saying they were going to be in Hamburg, going to be somewhere else, so that they were alerted? You were, it seems, contributing to the very thing you criticized.

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't believe Mr. Slocum alerted them, sir. He was trying to answer questions from the press. And the American press did not follow them around Germany. They were not there.

Senator MUNDT. I do not care whether they were informed or alerted. Your testimony is that you think the expenditure was justified as far as Mr. Slocum was concerned, so that Mr. Slocum could advise the press in response to their questions where they were going to be next. It would certainly make it easier to hold a press conference than if the press did not know. Is that not right?

Mr. KAGHAN. That is right.

Senator MUNDT. So you were contributing to the very thing you criticized. I do not know whether they held press conferences, but I do know that you made it easier for them to hold press conferences by telegraphing in advance where they were going to be.

Senator McCLELLAN. I question whether it is necessary for them to hold any press conferences if they are over there doing an investigating job as an agency of the committee. I have some doubt about the wisdom of their holding press conferences and giving out information. Because it is primarily the responsibility of the committee to give out information.

Mr. KAGHAN. The result, sir, of their press conferences was a raft of press comment and cartoons throughout the German press, which misinterpreted, misconstrued, and cast aspersions on the whole operation of the committee here, which I do not think did the United States any good.

Senator McCLELLAN. I did not ask you for your comment on that. I just expressed my own view. I do not know what the necessity was or what the wisdom was in giving out press conferences. There may be some. But I want to know one thing. Was this man, Slocum, under your employment and direction, and did you give him instructions to perform the duties or the services that he did perform in this connection?

Mr. KAGHAN. He is under my supervision and instruction. I did not inform him to keep track of these people.

Senator McCLELLAN. What directions did you give him? What instructions did you give him?

Mr. KAGHAN. To give whatever assistance these people needed in the way of meeting the press if they wanted to meet the press.

Senator McCLELLAN. After you gave them those instructions, and you ascertained that, and you ascertained that they did not want his services, did you take him off that duty?

Mr. KAGHAN. I did not know they didn't want his services. I was not so informed. And Mr. Slocum did not follow them around. He was on his own, so far as I was concerned, after he was advised or instructed to give them whatever services they lacked.

Senator McCLELLAN. Do you know whether he did follow them around after that?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; he did not follow them around.

Senator McCLELLAN. Who did follow them, if Slocum did not? If someone did, who was it?

Mr. KAGHAN. Mr. Monteconi was their escort officer and went with them.

Senator McCLELLAN. At all times?

Mr. KAGHAN. As far as I know. But he did not report to me, so I do not know whether he was with them at all times.

Senator McCLELLAN. Did Mr. Monteconi report to you that they no longer required his services, or did not want his services?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; he did not report anything to me.

Senator McCLELLAN. You say he did not report anything to you?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; he was not responsible to me. He didn't report to me.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to say, just to clear this up for the benefit of the other Senators: I have gone over this in detail with the

two investigators. We do know that what Mr. Kaghan says here is correct, in that Slocum kept the press fully informed as to where they were going, their train schedules, what information centers they were to visit. The press naturally followed them. They followed them through some of the libraries. Mr. Slocum, through Mr. Kaghan or someone else, gave the German press the names of the informants that these young men talked to, gave the questions and answers asked in many cases, and it was impossible for these young men not to answer the questions asked by newsmen when the newsmen were following them all over. I do not blame the newsmen. They were looking for news, and they were told where they would be at all times. It comes with rather bad grace from you, Mr. Kaghan, to object to their answering the pressmen, when you tell us one of the reasons you had a tail on them was for Mr. Slocum to keep the press informed as to where they were. I would like to make that clear.

And I have no criticism whatsoever of these two investigators for having answered the questions by the press. As far as I know, there was no formal press conference, but when 5 or 10 newsmen contact investigators and say, "What are you doing? Where are you going?"—they cannot very well stand mute.

Mr. COHN. Did you have some questions?

Mr. COHN. I wanted to just clear up this one point, Mr. Chairman. When we made this formal complaint to the Acting High Commissioner of Germany, before that we spoke to this so-called escort officer, and he continuously denied to us that he was following us. He kept saying he merely happened to be riding on the same conveyances and staying in the same hotels, because he was on his way to meet some Congressman who he kept missing at every stop, and going on with us to the next place. So the thing finally got to the point where he would walk into the room each time we were talking to a witness whose identity we did not care to have disclosed and we had to call the Acting High Commissioner a second time, saying we would leave Germany at once unless this man was withdrawn. Following that, he was withdrawn. But, as I say, the papers would carry the names of witnesses with whom we talked, and the questions we asked them. And, of course, that was a serious handicap.

Senator McCLELLAN. Did you give that information out to the press, or did the press obtain it from other sources?

Mr. COHN. We certainly did not. The press obtained it through other sources, and could only have obtained it, in a number of cases, through sources at HICOG. And we at no time revealed the name of any witness with whom we talked or any step being taken in the course of the investigation.

Mr. KAGHAN. Sir, may I state at the press conference you gave in Bonn, you told the press you had talked to Hoofnagel, who had briefed you in public affairs.

Mr. COHN. Well, I am not going to get into a running commentary.

The CHAIRMAN. The picture is quite clear on that now.

Mr. Kaghan, just going back to some of your statements, do you say all the books for your libraries are purchased in Washington?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir. There are some purchased in Germany. Very few.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you made any attempt to get the names of the individuals who were responsible for putting the Communist works on your shelves?

Mr. KAGHAN. I personally have not; no, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. If you would get his name, and if you had the power to fire him, would you fire him?

Mr. KAGHAN. If I found somebody was putting Communist books on our shelves, I would fire him.

The CHAIRMAN. If you found the man who had been putting them on the shelves, previous to the Dulles order, would you fire him?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes; I would have to look in the circumstances, sir. I could not fire anyone outright, without first inquiring as to why he did what he did and what the purpose was.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Reed Harris was quoted as saying the other day on a program that there were only 6 Communist books in the information libraries, and that those were there solely for the information officers. If he was correctly quoted, would you say that was a true statement, or a false statement?

Mr. KAGHAN. I am sorry, sir. Could I have the question repeated?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Reed Harris was quoted as saying that there were only 6 books in our information libraries by Communist authors, and that they were not there for the general public but merely for the information officers. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. KAGHAN. I couldn't judge that statement, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You could not? Is that a correct statement of the facts?

Mr. KAGHAN. I find it difficult to answer that, because I assume that all the books on the shelves of the American Houses are for the general public.

The CHAIRMAN. So that as far as you know, there were a sizable number of books by Communist authors on the general shelves for the general public?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; I do not know that there was a sizable number.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you said the works of some dozen Communist authors were there.

Mr. KAGHAN. I said I thought that possibility by this time a dozen authors may have been removed. There may be fewer. I remember 4 or 5 that I heard about.

The CHAIRMAN. So you do know there were the works of at least 4 or 5 Communist authors on the book shelves available to the general public?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes; I know that 4 or 5 authors were ordered removed from the shelves.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you: Did you write a play, Beyond Exile?

Mr. KAGHAN. The name is familiar; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does this play consist largely of a series of conversations between a father and son?

Mr. KAGHAN. Sir, I don't remember what that play was about.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I will refresh your recollection, then, if I may. Here is one of the speeches made by the son to the father. And this consists largely of a running argument, the father trying to con-

vince the son he should not be a Communist, the son trying to convince the father that he should be a Communist. Let us take the finale of this play. The son says:

Well, that's a fine how-do-you-do. It isn't enough that my father has to be a capitalist, but he's got to come out openly and betray his employees, just like all the other dirty capitalists. Do I have to come here and tell my own father that he is a slavedriver, an exploiter of labor, an enemy to civilization?

And the father, finally, in the close, has this to say. He says:

Peter, Peter, for God's sake listen to me, Peter. You were right, do you hear, you were right! I have been all wrong, Peter.

Would you say that that would make good anti-Communist propaganda?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir. It sounds pretty corny, now.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it merely corny? Is not that the Communist Party line right down to the last period?

Mr. KAGHAN. One of those statements would be the Communist Party line, yes. One of the characters that said that, apparently—

The CHAIRMAN. What part of this would not be the Communist line? The son arguing with the father that he should be a Communist, pointing out that the father is a dirty capitalist, an exploiter of labor, and the father ending by saying: "You were right, do you hear, you were right! I have been all wrong, Peter."

Is that not Communist propaganda?

Mr. KAGHAN. That would be Communist propaganda if that is what the whole play ends up with and is about. I don't recall what the play is about.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you like to review that play and give us your view of it?

Mr. KAGHAN. If you wish; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; I would like to have you do it.

I think this is what we will let you do. We will be going over your plays. Just so there will be no claim that we have taken the material out of context, I believe you should review these plays of yours and come back here tomorrow morning, and tell us which ones you consider are Communist-line plays and which ones are not; whether you think we have been unfair to you in reading the excerpts that we have.

Now let me ask you this question. If you today felt the same as you felt in 1939, would you think that you were a proper man to head this information program?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Highly improper, would it not be?

Mr. KAGHAN. If I had any ideas of signing any Communist petitions, I would be highly improper for this job.

The CHAIRMAN. You claim that the whole State Department was justified in hiring you because you convinced them that you had actually changed or reformed?

Mr. KAGHAN. I was not hired by the State Department, sir, in those days. I was hired by the Office of War Information.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you were finally hired by the Acheson State Department to head up its information program; were you not?

Mr. KAGHAN. Finally; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you claim they were justified in hiring you and putting you into this important position because some place in between, before 1939, the time they put you on the payroll, you had proven that you had reformed.

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir. They had the word of Gen. Geoffrey Keyes, the High Commissioner in Austria, under whom I worked, who said:

I consider that your organizational ability, competent supervision, journalistic talents, and sound judgment are chiefly responsible for the firm establishment and operation of this paper during the past 3½ years. Furthermore, under your guidance, we have initiated and fulfilled the responsibility placed upon us by the Department of the Army for the conduct of a positive public-information program in Austria. As you know, the formulation and implementation of our policies in this critical location have required the most serious consideration of their effect on local and world opinion. Your judgment and recommendations on these matters have been invaluable to me.

Signed, "Lt. Gen. Geoffrey Keyes, United States High Commissioner in Austria."

I think on the basis of that, the State Department was probably justified in hiring me for Germany.

The CHAIRMAN. Subsequent to that time, were letters of charges filed on you under the loyalty program?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir; they were.

The CHAIRMAN. And that was in connection with your application to get a job with the Voice of America?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; I do not know it was in connection with any application to get a job under the Voice of America.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you not learn that you have flunked that security-loyalty investigation?

Mr. KAGHAN. I learned it in the newspapers.

The CHAIRMAN. Pardon?

Mr. KAGHAN. I read that in the newspapers. Whether it is true or not, I do not know. I could not be flunked, sir, because I have had clearance officially from the State Department's Loyalty and Security Board.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think, as of today, that you are the proper man to run the job there?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes; I do.

The CHAIRMAN. We do not have permission to sit, so we will have to recess.

Mr. Kaghan, I think you should have sufficient time to dig up those editorials which you say are available in the State Department, that you wrote at some time or other, and you should have sufficient time to review these various plays. I do not think you would have time between now and 10:30 tomorrow morning. We will give you the entire weekend for that. Will that give you sufficient time?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we have a hearing for Monday. We will give you until Tuesday morning. That will give you plenty of time; will it not?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I may say you are free to put in the record anything that you think will be of benefit to the committee and anything which will create what you consider the correct light on your position, any letters from any of your associates, reports, editorials, et cetera. O. K.?

Mr. KAGHAN. Next Tuesday morning, sir?

The CHAIRMAN. At 10:30.

Mr. KAGHAN. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 12:05 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 10:30 a. m., Tuesday, May 5, 1953.)



STATE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION PROGRAM— INFORMATION CENTER

TUESDAY, MAY 5, 1953

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS
OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met (pursuant to S. Res. 40, agreed to January 30, 1953) at 10:30 a. m., in room 357 of the Senate Office Building, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, chairman, presiding.

Present: Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican, Wisconsin; Senator Karl E. Mundt, Republican, South Dakota; Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, Republican, Illinois; Senator Henry M. Jackson, Democrat, Washington; Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat, Missouri.

Present also: Roy M. Cohn, chief counsel; G. David Schine, chief consultant; Daniel G. Buckley, assistant counsel; Ruth Young Watt, chief clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The hearing will come to order.

We are to hear from Mr. Kaghan this morning. However, before Mr. Kaghan testifies we have several other witnesses who have testimony they want to give in regard to Mr. Kaghan's operations.

I think, Mr. Kaghan, you should hear them first. You will want to answer them, also.

Mr. COHN. Mr. Julius Epstein, please.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you raise your right hand, Mr. Epstein? In this matter now in hearing before the committee, do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. EPSTEIN. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Cohn.

Mr. COHN. Give us your full name, please, Mr. Epstein.

TESTIMONY OF JULIUS EPSTEIN

Mr. EPSTEIN. Julius Epstein.

Mr. COHN. And do you reside in New York City?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. COHN. Mr. Epstein, are you a journalist by profession?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. COHN. Presently employed as such?

Mr. EPSTEIN. I am a foreign correspondent for the *Industrie-Kurier*, Dusseldorf, Germany. I am also writing for some American publications and newspapers.

Mr. COHN. And in addition to your activities as a journalist, are you the author of some books?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. COHN. And have you been employed by the United States Government?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes. I was employed by the Office of War Information during the war from 1942 to 1944.

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt?

Is the press having difficulty hearing this witness?

The newsmen behind you would like to hear what you are saying, Mr. Epstein, and I am having difficulty, sitting here in front of you, in hearing all that you have to say.

Will you ask that question over again?

Mr. COHN. You are a journalist, Mr. Epstein, and an author, and you have been employed by the United States Government, having been an editor with the Office of War Information during the war; is that correct?

Mr. EPSTEIN. That is correct.

Mr. COHN. And as a consequence of your journalistic activities, and representing German newspapers that you do, are you familiar with the newspaper situation in Germany?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes. I am familiar to a certain degree.

Mr. COHN. Are you familiar particularly with a newspaper known as Neue Zeitung?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes, sir; I am familiar with the history of the Neue Zeitung, and its editor.

Mr. COHN. Its editor is a man named Hans Wallenberg; is that correct?

Mr. EPSTEIN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the record should show at this point that Neue Zeitung is a paper which the Information Services of HICOG, the High Commissioner of Germany, are presently running in Germany. Is that correct?

Mr. COHN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Kaghan has testified that Neue Zeitung is the official newspaper of the United States Information Service, of which Mr. Kaghan is Acting Deputy Director, and that he himself has been partially responsible for the operation of that paper. That is one of the main activities under the information program, of which he is Acting Deputy Director, and he has testified, too, about Mr. Wallenberg who, under Mr. Kaghan and his colleagues, is editor of that newspaper.

Now, I want to ask you this, Mr. Epstein. Do you know Hans Wallenberg, who is editor of this official newspaper of the United States Information Service?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes, sir. I know Hans Wallenberg.

Mr. COHN. Has Hans Wallenberg, to your knowledge, ever been active in the Communist movement?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Hans Wallenberg was, in the years 1939 and 1940, the executive secretary of the German-American Writers Association, a Stalinist and Communist-front organization of German refugee writers in New York.

Mr. COHN. And were you personally familiar with some of Mr. Wallenberg's activities in that organization?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes, I am personally familiar with his activities as executive secretary of that organization.

Mr. COHN. Were you present at a meeting of that organization when a resolution was introduced seeking to condemn Stalin at the time of the Hitler-Stalin Pact?

Mr. EPSTEIN. They never condemned Stalin. After the outbreak of the war, they made a press release accusing Hitler. When I read this, I asked the directors and officers of the German-American Writers Association to call a meeting for all members, and I complained about the method and I complained about the fact that they did not accuse and did not mention Stalin, who was an ally of Hitler. And I moved a resolution to that purpose. But they didn't vote upon my resolution, and Hans Wallenberg sided with the Stalinist majority. Then I left the organization. I resigned immediately and left the room of this meeting, in October, September or October, 1939, in New York.

The CHAIRMAN. You say at that time Wallenberg was with the Stalinist majority?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say that he was actively in the Communist movement at that time?

Mr. EPSTEIN. I do not know whether he was actively a member of the party or not, but the German American Writers Association was a subsidiary of the Schutzverband Deutscher Schriftsteller in Paris. That is only the German title of the same organization in Paris. And this organization was closed and dissolved by the French Government, because an investigation had shown that it was a purely Communist agency. It was closed by order of the Seine tribunal in Paris.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any information to the effect that Wallenberg might have at some time later broken with the Communist movement?

Mr. EPSTEIN. I have no such information.

The CHAIRMAN. Pardon me. Go ahead.

Mr. COHN. Now, Mr. Epstein, I want to come to some of Mr. Wallenberg's later activities. What is particularly relevant to us is his activities when he became the editor of Neue Zeitung, and became active, first, with the United States Information Program and their newspaper in Germany. When did Mr. Wallenberg become connected with Neue Zeitung?

Mr. EPSTEIN. As far as I know, Mr. Wallenberg became connected with the Neue Zeitung already in 1945, when Hans Habe was the first editor in chief of the Neue Zeitung. Hans Habe brought to Munich Stefan Heym, a Communist writer, who a few days ago sent back to President Eisenhower his Bronze Star and his American Army commission and fled to Eastern Germany.

The CHAIRMAN. I am having a lot of difficulty following you on this.

Will you, Mr. Cohn, try and recap what the witness said?

Mr. COHN. Mr. Epstein, do I understand your testimony to be that following Wallenberg's association with Neue Zeitung, in 1945, the paper was headed by Hans Habe, that Wallenberg was there, and that Stefan Heym was actually working for our paper in Germany?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes; he was an editor and contributor to the Neue Zeitung, and the editor in chief was Hans Habe.

Mr. COHN. Was Mr. Wallenberg with Neue Zeitung at that time?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt? For Senator Symington's benefit, this is Mr. Epstein, who is a journalist, who has written books, has worked for the United States Government. He has testified that Mr. Wallenberg, who is the editor of the paper run by the Information Service in Berlin, a paper that is costing us about \$3 million a year—is that right?

Mr. COHN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wallenberg was editor and active in a Communist-dominated organization in the early 1940's during the Hitler-Stalin pact. At that time this organization was willing to condemn Hitler but not Stalin, and Wallenberg was part of the Stalinist majority. That is essentially the testimony so far, I believe.

Mr. COHN. Now, you tell us that Mr. Wallenberg's connection with Neue Zeitung began in 1945, that Hans Habe was then the editor, Mr. Wallenberg was on the staff, and Stefan Heym was also on the staff of our newspaper there. Is that correct?

Mr. EPSTEIN. That is correct.

Mr. COHN. Now, did there come a time when Mr. Wallenberg became editor of Neue Zeitung?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes. I think it was in 1946, when Mr. Wallenberg became the editor in chief of the Neue Zeitung in Munich.

Mr. COHN. Now, this is very important, Mr. Epstein. Can you tell us whether, while Mr. Wallenberg was editor of the United States Information Service program newspaper in Germany, he employed any Communists to write for that newspaper?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes. When I made a research in the Library of Congress and went to Washington and asked for the volumes of the Neue Zeitung edited by Mr. Wallenberg, I found amongst the contributors to Wallenberg's Neue Zeitung a row of card-carrying members of the Communist Party, among them the most prominent writers of the German and Czech Communist Party.

Mr. COHN. This was as of what time?

Mr. EPSTEIN. This covered the year 1946 and 1947.

Mr. COHN. And Mr. Wallenberg, during that period, was the editor?

Mr. EPSTEIN. He was the editor of the Neue Zeitung.

Mr. COHN. The official newspaper of the United States information program?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes. And his name appears on it.

Mr. COHN. And that was the official newspaper of the United States Government?

Mr. EPSTEIN. This was the only daily newspaper owned by the American Government.

Mr. COHN. Now, would you name for us those Communist Party members who were writing for Neue Zeitung under Mr. Wallenberg's editorship?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Well, there was Stefan Heym, as I mentioned before. I found articles by Johannes R. Becher, B-e-c-h-e-r, one of the most prominent Communist writers, brought back from Moscow to Berlin to conduct the Communist propaganda in Germany.

The CHAIRMAN. You say this man was brought from Moscow to Berlin?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes; Becher lived as a refugee during the war in Moscow, and was one of the cofounders of the Free German Committee in Moscow. After the war the Russian Government sent Johannes R. Becher to Germany, and he became Commissar for Cultural Affairs in Germany, and he is still there.

The CHAIRMAN. His name was—

Mr. EPSTEIN. Johannes R. Becher, B-e-c-h-e-r.

Mr. COHN. Where is Mr. Becher now?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Mr. Becher is now in Berlin.

Mr. COHN. In the American Zone?

Mr. EPSTEIN. In the Soviet Zone.

Mr. COHN. In the Soviet Zone.

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes, and he is one of the high officials of the German Soviet Government.

Mr. COHN. And this man was writing for our newspaper in Germany?

Mr. EPSTEIN. This man was writing for Hans Wallenberg's newspaper. I also found a whole series of articles written by F. C. Weiskopf, W-e-i-s-k-o-p-f, a very well known Communist writer, who became, after the Communist coup d'etat in Prague, counsel to the Czech Embassy in Washington and later Ambassador for the Czech Government in Sweden and Peiping. I found articles in Hans Wallenberg's Neue Zeitung written by Anna Seghers, one of the most prominent women writers in the party.

Mr. COHN. Would you give us the spelling of her name?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Anna Seghers, S-e-g-h-e-r-s.

Mr. COHN. Have you named the five?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Pardon?

Mr. COHN. Let me see if I understand this. You say under Wallenberg's editorship of our newspaper in Germany, five Communists were employed and used as writers for this paper. You have named Stefan Heym, who, of course, within the last few weeks has gone over to the Soviet side. Is that correct?

Mr. EPSTEIN. That is correct.

Mr. COHN. And you have named a man by the name of Becher, B-e-c-h-e-r?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Becher; yes.

Mr. COHN. Is that right? And you say he is now one of the Communist leaders in the Soviet zone?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes; that is right. He is one of the oldest members of the German Communist Party. He became a member, already, in 1919, I guess.

Mr. COHN. Then you named a woman, Anna Seghers. That was spelled—

Mr. EPSTEIN. S-e-g-h-e-r-s.

Mr. COHN. And where is she now?

Mr. EPSTEIN. She is in the Eastern Zone, in the Soviet Zone of Germany.

Mr. COHN. And who are the other two?

Mr. EPSTEIN. The other two? F. C. Weiskopf, W-e-i-s-k-o-p-f. He became the first Czech Communist Ambassador to Sweden, and later to Peiping, and he worked as a consul at the Czech Communist Embassy in Washington.

Mr. COHN. And who is the fifth?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Stefan Heym.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you only named four so far.

Mr. EPSTEIN. I named Stefan Heym, Johannes R. Becher, F. C. Weiskopf, and Anna Seghers.

Mr. COHN. There were 4. Right? I kept saying "5." I am sorry. In other words, your testimony is that these four Communists were and continue to be active functionaries of the Communist Party while writing for our official newspaper in Germany under the editorship of this Mr. Wallenberg, who is still the editor of that newspaper. Is that correct?

Mr. EPSTEIN. That is correct.

Mr. COHN. Now, do you know the employment arrangement Mr. Wallenberg had with these people?

Mr. EPSTEIN. No; I don't know.

Mr. COHN. All you know is that they were writing for our newspaper. Is that right?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. COHN. Now, did there come a time, Mr. Epstein, when it came to your attention that Mr. Wallenberg was being considered for an even higher post in the United States information program, namely, a post with the Voice of America?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes. Hans Wallenberg came back from Germany in 1947, and he was slated to become a top adviser with the Voice of America in New York.

Mr. COHN. Who was about to appoint him to that job?

Mr. EPSTEIN. This was Mr. Charles Thayer, at that time the head of the Overseas Branch of the Voice of America in New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Charles—

Mr. EPSTEIN. Thayer. T-h-a-y-e-r.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the Mr. Thayer who has recently been discharged by Mr. Dulles?

Mr. EPSTEIN. That is correct.

Mr. COHN. Now, when it came to your attention that Mr. Wallenberg had come back and was about to become a top adviser to Charles Thayer, did you make an objection to this appointment?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes. When I heard about it, I wrote an article, "Hans Wallenberg and the Voice of America."

Mr. COHN. In that article, did you set forth names, dates, and places concerning Wallenberg's Communist record and the use of these Communists?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes. I exposed his pro-Communist and pro-Stalinist background in this article, which appeared under my name.

Mr. COHN. And after you wrote this in public print, without any immunity, did Mr. Wallenberg bring a libel suit?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Well, first the State Department investigated Mr. Wallenberg, and the security investigator came to New York and questioned Mr. Wallenberg. And I had the opportunity to talk to this investigator. He told me, in the presence of another witness, "Wallenberg admitted every fact Epstein has written." So this man wrote a report, which probably is now in the security files of the State Department.

The CHAIRMAN. May I say in fairness to Mr. Wallenberg that he would not be expected to bring a libel suit necessarily. If I brought

a libel suit against everyone who libeled me, I would do nothing else but be in court all the time. But he did bring a libel suit?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes. But this was much later. He brought a libel suit after 1 year.

Mr. COHN. He brought the libel suit just after the statute of limitations had run. Is that right?

Mr. EPSTEIN. That is right.

Mr. COHN. And this was in 1949?

Mr. EPSTEIN. This was in 1949.

Mr. COHN. And is it a fact that since that suit was brought, Mr. Wallenberg has done nothing to press that suit?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Nothing to my knowledge. I am still waiting for my day in court.

Mr. COHN. And that suit has not been pressed. Did it come to your attention that the State Department had denied security clearance to Mr. Wallenberg for this post with Mr. Thayer?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. COHN. I might state, Mr. Chairman, that we have checked with the Department of State and have been advised that Mr. Wallenberg was in fact denied security clearance on that occasion, although apparently on a subsequent occasion there was a reopening of the case, in an attempt to seek security clearance for him, and we are awaiting further report from the State Department on that situation.

Now, following the denial of the security clearance, do you know whether or not Mr. Wallenberg went back and resumed his activities as editor of Neue Zeitung?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. COHN. Is he editor of Neue Zeitung today?

Mr. EPSTEIN. He is today editor in chief and publisher of the Neue Zeitung.

Mr. COHN. When did he go back to Germany? Do you know?

Mr. EPSTEIN. In 1949, late 1949.

Mr. COHN. Has he been continuously the editor, Senator Dirksen wants to know, since that period of time?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Pardon?

Mr. COHN. Has Wallenberg been the editor continuously since that period of time?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes. That is right.

Mr. COHN. Is he now the editor?

Mr. EPSTEIN. He is now the editor.

Mr. COHN. I want to ask you this, Mr. Epstein. I know we called you to come down here on very short notice, and we have asked you to prepare some excerpts from Neue Zeitung under Wallenberg's editorship. You have told us you will prepare some, which we will check, and after we have checked them and checked the translations, I will ask the chairman for permission to insert them for the record.

There is one quote which you did show us last night, and which we did have checked, and I wonder if you could give that to us now.

I can read that. Would you identify it first, stating from where it comes?

The CHAIRMAN. I suggest that you read it and identify the source.

Mr. COHN. I will read this quote you furnished us from a writing of Wallenberg, and afterward I would like you to give us the date and

give us the original article from Neue Zeitung, which we can have for the record.

The quote is:

Between 1937 and 1946, there were 9 hard years, which, generally speaking, have proved Soviet policy right. Therefore it is no wonder that the victorious nation, aggrandized by the newly acquired countries of Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Karelia, the Carpatho-Ukraine, Ruthenia, Moldavia, Sakhalin, and East Prussia, votes exactly the same way as the threatened nation did.

Mr. EPSTEIN. That is correct.

Mr. COHN. Now, the words: "Between 1937 and 1946, there were 9 hard years, which, generally speaking, have proved Soviet policy right"—you say those words were Mr. Wallenberg's in Neue Zeitung?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes. Here is the original photostated. The date is February 15, 1946.

Mr. COHN. And that is the same Mr. Wallenberg who is now still the editor of that newspaper. Is that right?

Mr. EPSTEIN. That is correct.

Mr. COHN. Our official newspaper.

May that copy be received in the record, Mr. Chairman? We are having one further translation checked, as I know you will want to have that done before you receive anything into the record.

The CHAIRMAN. I suggest that it be marked as an exhibit, rather than having it put in the record. It will be marked as an exhibit.

(Material from Neue Zeitung, dated February 15, 1946, was marked "Exhibit No. 10," and may be found in the files of the subcommittee.)

Mr. COHN. Was this a signed editorial, do you know?

Mr. EPSTEIN. This is an article, World Political Review, by Hans Wallenberg.

Mr. COHN. This is a signed article by Mr. Wallenberg?

Mr. EPSTEIN. It is.

Mr. COHN. I have no further questions of Mr. Epstein.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Dirksen?

Senator DIRKSEN. Let me go back for a moment to Mr. Stefan Heym. Will you tell us what happened to him? What about this Army commission, and where is he at the present time?

Mr. EPSTEIN. He has always been a Communist. He was a member of the Communist youth group in Germany, and I met him for the first time in 1933, in Prague, Czechoslovakia, when I came to Prague as a refugee from Germany. I met him again in New York, where he was editor of the German Communist weekly called Volks Echo, V-o-l-k-s E-c-h-o. And he entered the Army—

Senator DIRKSEN. Entered the Army where?

Mr. EPSTEIN. During the war.

Senator DIRKSEN. Here, or abroad?

Mr. EPSTEIN. No, here. He became a member of the Army.

Senator DIRKSEN. Did he serve in uniform?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes.

Senator DIRKSEN. Where did he serve, if you know?

Mr. EPSTEIN. This I don't know.

Senator DIRKSEN. Abroad, or at home?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Abroad. And he received the Bronze Star.

Senator DIRKSEN. Was he an enlisted man, or an officer?

Mr. EPSTEIN. He was an officer.

Senator DIRKSEN. What rank?

Mr. EPSTEIN. I don't know.

Senator DIRKSEN. He received the Bronze Star?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes.

Senator DIRKSEN. And I suppose he was in service until after V-E Day?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes, certainly he was.

Senator DIRKSEN. Now, then, what happened to him from that point on?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Well, he wrote articles and books. As I was told, one of his anti-American books was printed in America and is now being reprinted in the Soviet Zone in Germany.

Senator DIRKSEN. What is the title?

Mr. EPSTEIN. I don't know the title, but I can provide it for you.

Senator DIRKSEN. How old is Mr. Heym?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Mr. Heym is about, I would say, 39 or 40.

Senator DIRKSEN. Do you spell his name with an "n" or "m"?

Mr. EPSTEIN. H-e-y-m.

Senator DIRKSEN. You said he sent his commission back to the President?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes. It was a news story, Senator, a few weeks ago, that he renounced his American citizenship.

Senator DIRKSEN. Where did this story appear?

Mr. EPSTEIN. This story appeared in every newspaper. I read it in the New York Times, in the Herald Tribune, and in other papers. He renounced his American citizenship. He fled to the Soviet zone, because he "couldn't endure the oppression in the American zone," and he sent back to President Eisenhower his Army commission and the Bronze Star he had received.

Senator DIRKSEN. And he is presently, then, in the Soviet zone?

Mr. EPSTEIN. He is presently in the Soviet zone.

Senator DIRKSEN. You do not know his activity at the present time?

Mr. EPSTEIN. No, certainly not.

The CHAIRMAN. I am going to suggest to counsel that you obtain the public statement made by Mr. Heym when he went behind the Iron Curtain. He had some rather vigorous statements to make about America at that time, and in praise of the Communist regime. I think it should be put in the record at this point, if you will get that.

(The statement referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 11," and will be found in the appendix on p. 243.)

Senator DIRKSEN. Do you have a copy of that dispatch, Mr. Epstein?

Mr. EPSTEIN. I have it in my files in New York.

Senator DIRKSEN. It is available?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes. Certainly. It was about 2 weeks ago in every paper.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be put in the record.

May I ask Mr. Cohn or Mr. Schine: Can you tell me how many of Mr. Heym's books are in our Information libraries now throughout the world?

Mr. SCHINE. We do not know at this time, Mr. Chairman. We will check that information. They are in wide use.

The CHAIRMAN. They are in wide use.

Senator DIRKSEN. Were you on the staff of the Neue Zeitung in Munich, Mr. Epstein?

Mr. EPSTEIN. The main editorial office is no more in Munich. I think it is now in Frankfurt.

Senator DIRKSEN. And where were you on duty with this newspaper?

Mr. EPSTEIN. I was never on duty with this newspaper.

Senator DIRKSEN. I see. You were a sort of free-lance journalist?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes; I am a free-lance journalist and foreign correspondent.

Senator DIRKSEN. How old are you?

Mr. EPSTEIN. I am 51.

Senator DIRKSEN. How much time have you spent abroad?

Mr. EPSTEIN. I spent all my life, until I came to this country, abroad. I was born in Vienna, lived in Germany, and after Hitler came to power I went to Prague, later to Switzerland and France, and I came over to America on March 9, 1939.

Senator DIRKSEN. And your present occupation now is that of a journalist and an author?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all, Mr. Epstein.

Thank you very much.

Mr. EPSTEIN. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. You have one more brief witness, do you, Mr. Cohn?

Mr. COHN. Just one more before Mr. Kaghan.

Mrs. Utley?

The CHAIRMAN. You have been previously sworn, Mrs. Utley.

May I say that there are many things we would like to question you on this morning. We may not cover the entire scope of your testimony. We may restrict ourselves largely to the things connected with Mr. Kaghan, because we want to hear Mr. Kaghan this morning. If we do not hear you fully, you will be called back in the next few days to complete your testimony.

I know about your trips through Europe that you made recently, and I think you have a lot of valuable information for the committee. We may not take all of that this morning.

Mr. COHN. Mrs. Utley, as the chairman indicated, this morning I want to ask you about two specific items which you discussed with Mr. Sehine and myself before we went abroad. Now, first, as a matter of identification, you are Freda Utley, the author; is that correct?

TESTIMONY OF FREDA UTLEY

Mrs. UTLEY. I am.

Mr. COHN. And could you name your last two books?

Mrs. UTLEY. The China Story, and The High Cost of Vengeance on Germany.

Mr. COHN. And you are also the author of Lost Illusion; is that right?

Mrs. UTLEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt? I think we should have the record complete now, as to the books which Stefan Heym wrote which are in the Information Program, their locations.

No. 1, The Crusaders. The locations: Mexico, Montevideo, Stockholm, Lisbon, and The Hague. No. 2, Les Croises. The locations: Algiers, Belgrade, Casablanca. A third one, entitled "The Hostages." Locations: Florence, Belgrade, Hilo, Lahore, Palermo, Naples, Milan, and Turin. The fourth, Of Smiling Peace, is in the armed-services edition. It is impossible to know the complete whereabouts of that. That is apparently one printed by the armed services.

You have verified this, have you, through the State Department?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In order that we may have you fully identified, you are an author, have written a number of books, and I understand about 25 or 30 years ago for a short period of time you were a member of the British Communist Party?

Mrs. UTLEY. I was a member of the British Communist Party from 1928 to 1930 only.

The CHAIRMAN. And you were a member from 1928 to 1930.

Mrs. UTLEY. Actually, I went to live in Russia at the end of 1930, and did not apply to join the Russian Communist Party.

Senator SYMINGTON. Your membership in the British Communist Party extended from 1928 until what date?

Mrs. UTLEY. I lapsed out, and I ceased to be a member in 1931.

The CHAIRMAN. I think Senator Symington's question was: You were a member of the British Communist Party from 1928 until when?

Mrs. UTLEY. Until 1930, or, to put it on the outside, the middle of 1931.

The CHAIRMAN. 1930 or 1931. And then you went to live in Russia when?

Mrs. UTLEY. I went to live in Russia in September 1930. And, since I was disillusioned very rapidly, I did not apply to transfer to the Russian Communist Party; and, therefore, ceased to be a member of the Communist Party. But I remained in Russia because I was married to a Russian, and he could not leave.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, your husband, who was a Russian, was he liquidated? Was he killed by the Communist Party?

Mrs. UTLEY. He was arrested in April 1936, condemned to a concentration camp without trial, and I have long presumed him dead.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you went to Russia with your husband, and in April of 1936 he was arrested by the Communists, and you say without a trial he was condemned to a concentration camp, and you have not heard from him since?

Mrs. UTLEY. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. And let me ask you this. You have been active in writing books and articles that are definitely anti-Communist. Is that correct?

Mrs. UTLEY. I have been engaged in writing such books since 1939.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

Mr. COHN. Mrs. Utley, as I say, we want to ask you this morning about two specific items concerning the information program in Germany, in HICOG, which you talked to Mr. Schine and myself about before we went abroad, and which we were able to check on in some detail while in Germany. The first one is this. You spent a considerable period of time in Germany during the last year; is that correct?

Mrs. UTLEY. Yes. I was there more than half of last year.

Mr. COHN. While you were in Germany, did there come to your attention the fact that the United States information program had paid for and begun to distribute a book which followed the Communist line?

Mrs. UTLEY. In November last, Mr. Cohn, the German papers were full of this scandal. And I think one of them, for instance, a Cologne paper, said, this is only typical:

American officials in the Federal Republic embarrassedly admitted that they financed Communist propaganda when giving 200,000 deutschmarks—

That is roughly \$45,000, I think.

Mr. COHN. That is about \$45,000.

Mrs. UTLEY. Yes. 200,000 deutschmarks—

to Anna and Louisa Peters to publish their Synchronoptical World History.

Mr. COHN. Synchronoptical World History. Was that the name of the book?

Mrs. UTLEY. Yes. It is called Synchronoptische Weltgeschichte. And it also said that:

Recalling that this so-called history book had been distributed to Amerika Hauses and reading rooms, papers stressed that it was only after more than a thousand copies of the book were already in circulation that the publishers were unmasked as Communists.

That is actually a summary of what was being said in the German press, given out by the daily press review issued by HICOG. That is, our own people admitted it.

Mr. COHN. Do you have a copy of that book here in the hearing room with you?

Mrs. UTLEY. Here is the book.

Mr. COHN. Have you been able to go through that book in some detail?

Mrs. UTLEY. I have spent several days now going through that book.

Mr. COHN. How is the book set up? Could you tell us that?

Mrs. UTLEY. Yes. It is a little difficult to explain. It is all done like a tremendous chart. It follows on page after page. They are all connected. And the book is divided up into historical personages, wars and revolutions, technical achievements, cultural developments, and so on, in different sections, and different kinds of print, and different kinds of colors. You cannot exactly read it. You have to study it and look things up in it.

Mr. COHN. You say during the last several days you have made an intensive study of this book. Is that right?

Mrs. UTLEY. I have.

Mr. COHN. Having examined this book, Mrs. Utley, can you tell us whether or not you believe the charge that it follows the Communist line is a well-founded charge?

Mrs. UTLEY. I do believe it to be a well-founded charge, because this book is quite definitely historical materialism, without any doubt. That is, it is a Marxist history of the world. And secondly, it takes pains to always boost everything Russian, just like a Soviet book does; even prerevolutionary Russia. They will give space to every little thing, like mentioning that a bell was cast in the Kremlin, while giving no space or very little space to really important world events.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you, at the request of the committee, translated several excerpts from this book?

Mrs. UTLEY. Do you want me to read some?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

May I suggest, in view of the fact that Mrs. Utley has given you the excerpts, Mr. Cohn, and you have checked them, that it might expedite matters if you would read the excerpts and have Mrs. Utley identify them?

Mr. COHN. I will read, first, Mrs. Utley, and I wish you would follow along, a quotation from this book, when the authors describe their version of Josef Stalin. Is that correct?

Mrs. UTLEY. Right.

Mr. COHN. You follow along. Stalin:

Soviet statesman * * * bound up the solution of national questions with the international class war. Created the first Socialist constitution; realized planned economy with the First Five Year Plan, and built up the Red army as a people's army, thereby succeeding in saving the Soviet Union when attacked by the Fascist powers, and supporting the revolution in Europe and Asia. As the accepted leader of world communism he gave the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin their present valid form.

Is that right?

Mrs. UTLEY. Correct.

Mr. COHN. That "he gave the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin their present valid form"?

Mrs. UTLEY. Of course, the key word is "valid."

Mr. COHN. The key word is "valid." He says the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin are valid.

I think this is interesting. He goes on to describe Churchill. I wish you would follow along on this.

Churchill:

Son of an aristocratic English father and an American mother. After service as a colonial officer in the Boer War, prepared England by propaganda for war against Germany. After the defeat of Germany, he sought to overthrow the Soviet state by intervention and also fought in England against the rising Socialist movement. * * * In the Second World War he led England on the side of the Soviet Union and the United States to victory over Germany. Since then, he has tried to unite the state of Western Europe against the Soviet Union in dependence on the United States.

Is that right?

Mrs. UTLEY. Mr. Cohn, may I just say there that it is also very significant, you see, that there is nothing else in about Churchill of any importance. The really great things that Churchill did are not in at all.

Mr. COHN. Right.

He goes on and describe Mao Tse-tung, the Communist leader of China, as follows:

Chinese statesman; son of poor peasants. * * * When the Kuomintang under Chiang Kai-shek abandoned its Socialist aims he founded a Red army and continued the revolutionary fight against great odds. Under his leadership, the revolution was fully victorious against the armies of Chiang Kai-shek supported by the United States. Since then he has labored, in close alliance with the Soviet Union, to construct a Communist economy and culture.

He goes on and talks about the Russian revolution. By the way, he keys his whole passage on the Russian revolution as if the Bolsheviks overthrew the Czar, and he makes no mention of Kerensky and the February revolution.

Mrs. UTLEY. I thought it was one of the most significant things in the book that there was no mention of Kerensky at all or of the really liberal government that was established in 1917.

Mr. COHN. I quote:

The Russian workers and peasants victoriously overthrew the Tsardom, nobles, church, and bourgeoisie, and maintained themselves against the counter-revolution and intervention which were supported by England, Germany, Japan, and France.

In talking about the Spanish civil war, he says:

Fascists under Franco defeat, with help of Germany and Italy, the republican order supported by democrats of all the world, especially the Communists.

Mrs. UTLEY. Yes. May I remark there, Mr. Cohn, that throughout the book the word "democratic" is used to cover communism, as if it was the same kind of democracy as ours.

Mr. COHN. And I think there is just one more. In talking of the Chinese revolution, it says:

Rising of the Chinese peasants and workers against the government of Chiang Kai-shek caused by the increasing social contradictions and growing economic and political dependence on foreign countries. After long hopeless fights of the rebels the intervention of Japan brings decisive changes. The Communist rebels take an important part in fight against Japan and continue the revolutionary fight after the elimination of the aggressors. Under leadership of Mao Tse-tung they completely defeat armies of Chiang supported by United States.

Mrs. UTLEY. Mr. Cohn, may I add one short one on Greece that I didn't put on this list, which is very significant?

Mr. COHN. Surely.

Mrs. UTLEY. It says, on Greece after the war:

Struggle of the Communists and republican forces of Greece against the monarchy supported by the United States.

Mr. COHN. Yes, "the monarchy supported by the United States." And we emphasize particularly, of course, the reference to Stalin, that "he gave the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin their present valid form."

Mr. Chairman, there are additional quotes. I would rather not go into them.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Mrs. Utley whether this is her statement at the bottom of the last page. To me it seems rather significant. You say:

As against the mention of every revolution, and of every revolutionary, they approve of, the authors exclude from their list of historical personages such figures as Chiang, Woodrow Wilson, Hoover, Gladstone, Garibaldi, La Fayette, et cetera.

Mrs. UTLEY. Those were just a few obvious ones. And I might add to that, Senator, that for instance they will dig up some obscure person in the past. They have a fellow called Kobad, for example, in the fifth century, and he is nobody anybody ever heard of, but he happened to say that private property was the root of all evil, so he gets a long, big line.

Senator MUNDT. Does this book you are talking about purport to be a history of all the important personages of the world?

Mrs. UTLEY. Well, more than that. It is supposed to be a history showing the important personages, the wars, and revolutions, the technical developments, the cultural developments, the writers, the poets,

the thinkers, the philosophers, the industrial and technical developments.

Senator MUNDT. All the world leaders that have contributed to civilization, apparently.

Mrs. UTLEY. Yes.

Senator MUNDT. It seems to be bipartisan, however. It leaves out both Woodrow Wilson and Herbert Hoover.

Mrs. UTLEY. The technical and cultural part is loaded up. Anna Seghers is in, and Jack Belden's China Shakes the World. You won't find a single anti-Communist book mentioned in the cultural section.

The CHAIRMAN. May I read two other quotes to you, Mrs. Utley? Bernard Shaw:

* * * saw in the capitalist system the real cause for the decline of morality in individual and community life, * * * fought for a new, Socialist world order.

Is that the correct description of Shaw?

Mrs. UTLEY. Well, I think, personally, it is an exaggeration.

The CHAIRMAN. I say: Is that the correct interpretation?

Mrs. UTLEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us take one other.

St. Paul:

* * * took the revolutionary content out of Christ's teaching and so prepared it for the conquest of the world without force.

Is that the correct quote?

Mrs. UTLEY. That is a correct quote.

Mr. COHN. Now, Mr. Chairman, without going into further excerpts from this book, I might say this: We checked on this in some detail over in Germany, and we have now received a full report on this incident from the State Department. If I may, I will summarize it.

The official assigned by the State Department to read this book and render a report, one of the top people in the Division of Cultural Affairs of Hi-Cog, rendered the following report: that this book shows—

A very definite and obvious pro-Communist, anti-democratic, anti-Catholic, and in a number of occasions anti-Semitic and antitheological prejudice.

He states that—

The tendentious editing is recognizable not only by statements along pro-Communist lines but also by the omission of important names and facts and the assignment of much space to items which would not deserve it under an objective basis.

He goes on to say that this was, in fact, financed by the United States information program at HICOOG to the tune of some \$50,000, I believe, slightly over the figure Mrs. Utley had; that after it was financed and printed, it was used in the United States information program to this extent:

The Public Affairs Division of HICOOG, of which Mr. Kaghan has been Acting Deputy Director, uses 200 copies of it. They put 262 copies of this book in the United States information centers in Germany and in the mobile book kits we distribute in Germany, 720 of these books were distributed to education service centers, and 9 of these books were distributed to Public Affairs field centers.

In addition to the somewhat over 1,000 books that were distributed under the information program, there were an additional 1,707 copies which were awaiting distribution, and I understand now that the State

Department has ordered that these books be not distributed in any further respect.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand that you are reading now from a report which the State Department gave you?

Mr. COHN. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. And this is a survey which Mr. Dulles had asked for?

Mr. COHN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And is it also correct that Mr. Dulles has ordered or someone under Mr. Dulles has ordered the removal of this book from all of our libraries?

Mr. COHN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And an important question: Have they yet been able to tell you, Mr. Cohn, that they have removed the men responsible for spending some \$50,000 on this Communist history?

Mr. COHN. Our information, Mr. Chairman, and I assume you will want to ask Mr. Kaghan about this, is that the men responsible have not been removed.

Senator MUNDT. Have they been identified?

Mr. COHN. In this report, Senator Mundt, which I would like to submit to you and the members of the committee, I think that they are very clearly identified.

The CHAIRMAN. May I say that I think we cannot be too critical of the new leadership in the State Department. They have not had too long yet to clean house, and with some 40,000 people, and millions of books, it will take some time.

I think this should be made part of the record. Have you extra copies so that we can give all the members of the committee a copy of this?

Mr. COHN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I do not know whether we can have the entire thing made part of the record. There are some portions which you may like to look at, which contain some security matter which perhaps should not go in, in this form.

The CHAIRMAN. May I suggest that it be all made part of the record, but that you first check with the security officers to see if they object to any part being made part of the record.

Mr. COHN. Very well.

(The material referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 12," but the State Department advised the subcommittee that this report is classified and therefore cannot be made available to the public.)

Mr. COHN. Now, one other thing you suggested that we check into before going was a situation concerning a newspaper known as the Fuldaer Volks Zeitung, F-u-l-d-a-e-r V-o-l-k-s Z-e-i-t-u-n-g.

Mrs. UTLEY. Excuse me. It is F-u-l-d-a.

Mr. COHN. I was reading the title of the newspaper.

Now, with reference to this newspaper, published in Germany, you told us to check what? What had you heard?

Mrs. UTLEY. I had heard about this scandal in a paper called the Kasseler Post last October.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Utley, the newsmen would like to hear what you say.

Mrs. UTLEY. I am sorry.

The CHAIRMAN. When you rapidly name German papers, will you give us the spelling of the papers?

Mrs. UTLEY. It was reported in the K-a-s-s-e-l-e-r Post, the same as our Post, October 18, 1952, that the Fulda Volks Zeitung had a publisher called Heinrich Kiersecke, K-i-e-r-s-s-e-c-k-e, and that this paper had received a 300,000 marks subsidy from the United States information authorities from HICOG; and that this Mr. Kiersecke used the printing plant he acquired with this money to print Communist literature, including the Communist Party's Parliamentary Survey.

Mr. COHN. That was an official Communist Party publication?

Mrs. UTLEY. Yes.

Mr. COHN. And the allegation was, that you brought to our attention that the United States information program, out of this revolving fund, had given some 300,000 marks to this newspaper; that they had purchased the printing plant and used that plant to print this official organ of the Communist Party?

Mrs. UTLEY. That is right.

Mr. COHN. I might state, Mr. Chairman, we were able to check out those facts, confirm them, and yesterday morning a communication was received from the State Department advising us that there had in fact been a loan of 300,000 marks to this Fulda Volks Zeitung, and that after this loan was made, "It was discovered that the publisher, Kiersecke, had begun printing Communist material with the printing plant purchased with our money." Following that, the loan was recalled, and further funds were withdrawn from this newspaper. This was confirmed to us by the State Department as of Monday morning.

Senator MUNDT. Were you able, Mr. Cohn, while you were in Germany, to determine by what process HICOG determined to whom it was going to make these loans?

It seems utterly unjustifiable to make a loan of that kind. There certainly was not a very careful check made. Who was responsible, and what kind of check did they tell you they made, and how is it that they spent this amount of the taxpayers' money in Germany subsidizing Communist plants? That, to me, is as utterly inexcusable squandering of public money.

Mr. COHN. Senator Mundt, they said that they have advised us that they have a publishers' committee, a committee consisting of German publishers, which acts merely in an advisory capacity, makes recommendations, but that the decisions as to which newspapers are to receive financing by the United States are made by the Public Affairs Division in Hi-Cog.

Senator MUNDT. Who is in charge of that?

Mr. COHN. The man in charge of that is Mr. Boerner, and Mr. Kaghan is his chief assistant at the present time. Prior to Mr. Boerner there was Mr. Shepard Stone.

Now, Senator Mundt, we have the situation concerning this one newspaper. I might state, as the chairman wrote to the Secretary of State, we have in process of preparation a series of editorials and articles from many of these other newspapers, which are violently anti-American in tone and in content, with some rather pointed remarks directed against Secretary Dulles and the President of the United States, against the United States as a whole, and against American policy. But that, I think, should be fully documented within the next few days.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, there is some sentiment, as you know, in the Senate, that we have gone overboard on this business of foreign aid and are spending too much. I think we certainly are spending too much in foreign aid when we are giving part of it to the Communists.

The CHAIRMAN. May I say I heartily agree? And while those papers certainly have a right to criticize America or Dulles or Mr. Eisenhower, I certainly question the wisdom of financing the papers so that they will be able to do that. If they were not being financed by us, they certainly should have complete freedom, and we certainly should not try to tell them what to do, but it is inconceivable that Mr. Kaghan and his group over there should finance papers that are printing Communist material in their shops and making attacks on our Department of State. We will want to ask Mr. Kaghan when he comes up about that.

Pardon me, Mr. Cohn.

Mr. COHN. I have nothing further of Mrs. Utley.

The CHAIRMAN. I have much more material I would like to question Mrs. Utley about, but we told Mr. Kaghan that he could come here today, and we gave him a week to prepare himself to answer the material that has been produced against him, and therefore I very much dislike taking up the entire morning.

Mrs. UTLEY. May I say one short thing at the end, that I would like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that personally I am not trying to say, and I don't think the committee is, that such books as this should not be allowed to be published; but that the emphasis in my mind, and my interest in this, was that there was no need for us to publish Communist propaganda. It is not a question of saying the Germans may not publish anything they like.

And on that point, there are two other things I want to say. The first is that I have already had a couple of letters from Germany, from people connected with some of the best newspapers there, saying how happy they are that at long last this question of subsidies to leftwing papers in Germany is being undertaken as a matter of investigation. Because the best papers in Germany have always hated the very idea of subsidies and considered that it deprived them of a free press.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Utley, I think the committee would agree with you that we should not try to tell the German people what to publish. If they want to publish Communist books, it is their right.

The sole question is, Should we pay for those publications?

Mrs. UTLEY. And, Senator, at the time the money was started being paid out for that book in 1948, I myself visited schools in the camps for expellees, where there wasn't enough money to provide children with textbooks, and everything had to be done on a blackboard. Yet this enormous amount of money is spent for an enormous amount of this nonsense. Excuse me for adding that at the end.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mrs. Utley.

We would like to have you come back in the future. I think that you, from your writings and from your study of this problem and concern with it, can be a very valuable witness on a number of other items.

I do not want to take up, however, Mr. Kaghan's time this morning. We would like to get him on the stand.

Thank you very much.

Mrs. Utley, I would like to express for myself, and I think I can speak for the committee, our thanks to people like yourself, who spend 3 or 4 or 5 days a week studying the matters we ask you to study, at no compensation whatever, and doing it merely as a public service. I want to thank you very much.

Mrs. UTLEY. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kaghan?

You will be allowed, Mr. Kaghan, to place in the record or give us as exhibits any material which you think will explain any of the derogatory evidence which has come up in regard to you.

I might say there is one thing that concerns me very much and I think concerns all the other members of the committee, and I hope you will spend some time on this. We have, by your own admission, the evidence that you for a year's time, and part of it after the Hitler-Stalin pact, lived with a man that you knew was a Communist; that you worked for a man you knew was a Communist, as a writer; that you belonged to a group that you knew was Communist dominated; that you signed a petition for the Communist Party after the Hitler-Stalin pact, that primary election petition, in which you pledged to support the Communist candidate; that you wrote plays, which, as you said—I believe you denied that they followed the Communist line, but you said they were acceptable to the Communists.

The thing that concerns us now is any proof you have that shows that you have changed; not that you may have changed in your own mind, but anything that would indicate to the people that hired you and gave you this important job that you had changed from your thinking in 1939.

As you stated the other day, you thought you would be unfit for this job if you still felt the same way you did in 1939. Now, for you merely to come here and tell us that your thinking changed will not mean too much. We are concerned with what you positively did to convince your prospective employers that you should head up this tremendous program, have control of the expenditure of some \$61 million last year to a great extent; and if you could give us that proof positive, it would help the committee quite a bit.

FURTHER TESTIMONY OF THEODORE KAGHAN

Mr. KAGHAN. Thank you, sir.

You asked me to look at my plays to see if the excerpts that were read here were a fair example of what they were about. I haven't read those plays, sir, for 20 years. I wrote one 20 years ago and one 18 years ago. I had a vague idea that they were not in favor of communism, but I was not able to state so categorically, until I read those plays.

I have since read those plays, and I have some excerpts here which will show that not only did they not follow the Communist line, but they were a rejection of communism for the United States; not in 1 line or 2, but in lines from the beginning to the end of these plays, which I have a few lines from, which I beg the permission of this committee to read.

The CHAIRMAN. As you read them, will you identify the play and tell us whether it had been produced by a Communist organization,

and whether those were the plays that you found acceptable to the Communists, or not acceptable?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir. You quoted from Beyond Exile. Beyond Exile was a 3-act play that I wrote before I was 21, at the University of Michigan. It won a \$250 Avery Hopwood award there. It was a play about a Russian revolutionary of 1904 who came to America in 1906 in order to carry on his revolutionary work.

Here is a scene where he has just arrived in the United States, has moved in with his Americanized relatives. He wants to know about American Bolsheviks. This is in the first or second scene in the play. And his American relatives say:

No Bolsheviks here. We don't need 'em. We don't need no revolutions either.

And his American uncle says:

No, Michael. Here is different than in Russia. Here a workingman is free. He can become a capitalist himself if he wants to.

And later the Russian says:

But there are people who do not have plenty to eat. They are my comrades.

And his American uncle says:

Where? Where are people who do not have plenty to eat? In the streets, the loafers, the bums, who won't work. They do not have enough to eat because they are too lazy to work. Anybody who wants to work can have plenty to eat.

And later on, sir, and you will find all this from page 42 onward, his uncle tells him if he can't get him a job as a tailor he will make a butcher out of him in his own meat shop. He says:

From a tailor to a butcher shouldn't be such a hard job, eh, Michael?

Michael says:

I would rather cut cloth than cut flesh.

And his uncle says:

See. You wouldn't make a good Bolshevik anyway.

The CHAIRMAN. You claim this is an anti-Communist play?

Mr. KAGHAN. I claim this is a rejection of communism.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to know whether you claim this is an anti-Communist play. Either you think it is or you think it is not.

Mr. KAGHAN. It is a play opposed to communism in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. It is opposed to communism?

Mr. KAGHAN. It is opposed to communism in the United States. May I read further?

The CHAIRMAN. Is it opposed to communism any place else?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir. It doesn't take up the question of communism any place else except in Russia.

The CHAIRMAN. You say this is a play which is opposed to communism in the United States?

Mr. KAGHAN. The thesis of this play is that communism has no place in the United States. And I can prove it, if you will let me read a few more lines.

The CHAIRMAN. You may read as much as you wish.

Mr. KAGHAN. That is how he was introduced to America and thrives in America, and when his communistic sister comes from Russia and

wants money for her Communist friends this same former revolutionary, now living in America, says:

I will give no more money to you or your friends. Let them learn what it is to be Americans and fight for their country; and if they can't be Americans, let them go back to Russia.

And in the last act, when he is a wealthy department-store owner, and his son has become a Communist in the 1930's, during the depression, he talks to his son, and he says:

Peter, you are talking like a child. You have been filled full of the communistic propaganda that they give the peasants in Russia. * * * Where is your common sense?

And the radical young son says:

Don't worry about my commonsense. Commonsense tells me that the world is all wrong, and it is men like you who made it wrong.

And the father, who used to be a revolutionary, says to his son:

Maybe it is wrong, Peter. God knows it isn't right, but communism isn't the solution to the problem.

And later on, when the rich man's son joins a Communist-led strike against his father, and the press interviews the father, who used to be a Communist from Russia, the father says:

* * * the radicals who have been sent here by the Russian Government and who are in the pay of the Soviet should be sent back to their own country. America can solve its own social and economic maladjustments without foreign aid.

That is in the next to the last scene of the play. And that is what the Russian revolutionary learned about America.

But when his son is killed in the last act, in the next to the last scene, in the strike riot, you read a line, sir, which supposedly indicated the man had been converted. He was stricken with remorse because his son had died. Certain lines were read. What was not read was the last line.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you read the line I read?

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Kaghan, will you identify these people by their names? You said "old man" and "son." Our transcript says "Peter," and so on.

Mr. KAGHAN. Michael is the young revolutionary who became the old man at the end of the play. Peter is his young son.

Senator MUNDT. Peter is Michael's son?

Mr. KAGHAN. Peter is Michael's son at the end of the play. There is another "Peter" at the beginning of the play.

Senator MUNDT. What is the name of the Russian revolutionary?

Mr. KAGHAN. Michael.

Senator MUNDT. Michael?

Mr. KAGHAN. Michael; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us see if we can correctly describe the play. It consists largely of conversations between the father and the son. Is that right?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir. It consists of a number of other things. I hope there is more action in it than conversations. It is a bad enough play as it is.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, is it not largely dialog between Peter and Michael?

Mr. KAGHAN. In one scene; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And your other actors?

Mr. KAGHAN. There are dozens of other actors in this, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But does this not follow pretty much the line of one man trying to convince the other that communism is good and the other individual persuading him that it is bad?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir. It is about a Communist who comes to America and finds this is no place for communism. He becomes a wealthy satisfied man whose son in the depression becomes a Communist and that old man tries to tell him not to make the same mistakes he made.

The CHAIRMAN. Was this play reviewed favorably by the Daily Worker also?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't think it could have been, sir, and nobody in his right mind would have produced it.

The CHAIRMAN. I maintain that people who write these Communist plays are not in their right mind.

Mr. KAGHAN. Well, sir. I do not think this was a Communist play, and I would wish to put it in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. May I read some of the passages to you?

Mr. KAGHAN. Please do.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us take this one:

For centuries the aristocracy have oppressed the workers and the peasants, driven them to the fields, chained them to the mills, buried them in the mines.

Would you say that that is the Communist line?

Mr. KAGHAN. That is the Russian revolutionary of 1904 in Russia.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, this was not prepared in 1904. It was prepared when? 1935?

Mr. KAGHAN. That is a quotation from a line spoken in 1904 in Russia—in Czarist Russia.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you were not quoting anyone. You made this up. These are fictional characters.

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir. I put those in the mouth of a man who was in Czarist Russia in 1904.

The CHAIRMAN. So these are the words you put in your character's mouth?

Mr. KAGHAN. I put those words in that character's mouth in 1904.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us read some more.

They have seized their wheat to make cake for their feasts. They have emptied the land of its food to stuff their glutinous bellies. They have robbed the workers of their earnings to buy gold and diamonds for their fat wives and their bloodsucking mistresses.

Pretty good anti-Communist stuff, is it not?

Mr. KAGHAN. Rotten, sir. Rotten. I don't believe anybody could get anywhere with it.

The CHAIRMAN (reading):

They have taken everything for themselves and left nothing but misery and starvation. For centuries they have sucked the milk from the breast of our great mother while the rest of her children cried for food.

For centuries they have kept the lower classes in ignorance and destitution for fear that a little knowledge, a little ease, would wake them up to the truth, would make them see the injustices of their terrible plight, as light shows the dirt and the vermin and the cobwebs in the dark corners of a peasant's hovel.

Do you think we should use that today to fight communism?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, turn back to the end of the book, page 102. The old man is being lectured by his son, and he says this:

Peter, Peter, for God's sake, listen to me, Peter. You were right, do you hear? You were right. I have been wrong all along, Peter.

You have this dialogue between the father and the son, the son urging communism on the father, the father talking against it, but he ends up saying:

You were right. I have been wrong all along.

You say that is anti-Communist?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir, I don't say that is anti-Communist.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it taken out of context?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir, it is taken out of context.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Look at the book. Read whatever you want to, to explain that.

Mr. KAGHAN. I am afraid you have given me the wrong play.

The CHAIRMAN. Page 102.

Mr. KAGHAN. This is a play that has not even been discussed here. The play is on microfilm. I read it at the Library of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not have the play with you?

Mr. KAGHAN. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, can you explain to what extent that is taken out of context?

Mr. KAGHAN. It is taken out of context, in that the man is struck by the death of his son and believes that he has betrayed his oath that he made in 1904. So he goes back to Russia to relive his youth, and there the Soviet Stalinists throw him out. That is the end of the play. He is not converted to communism in the United States. He goes back to Russia, where he thinks he can practice it, and he finds he can't practice it there, either.

The CHAIRMAN. You think this is anti-Communist?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir. I don't think it is pro-Communist. I don't think any Communist organization could possibly produce it.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, let me read some more from it, and see if you think a Communist organization could produce this.

We must undermine the foundation which holds up this regime, this regime of the aristocracy, by destroying the ignorance of the people and substituting communism as a foundation upon which we, the masses, can build our workers' state. It is a slow and dangerous process, Comrade, this destruction, but it must be done. We must show the people why they have no bread, why they starve, crying to know for whom they sweat and toil in winter and summer, day and night, year after year, endlessly giving their very blood so that that imbecile Duchess may give her dog cream to drink out of a silver platter.

Would you consider that anti-Communist propaganda?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; that is not anti-Communist propaganda, but I don't think it will do the Communists any good, either.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me read another passage.

I know the Communists can rely on you to your last breath. You have much to lose, the odds are great, but, Comrade, we can win, we must win. The fate of millions of people depends on us. And when the great day arrives, the dead, weeping with joy, as well as the living, will bless their emancipators for the sacrifice they have made for the resurrection of Russia.

Would you say that is Communist Russian propaganda?

Mr. KAGHAN. It could have been in 1904.

The CHAIRMAN. Would it be today?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't think it would be good Communist propaganda today; no, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How about 1935, when you wrote it?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't think it could have been. They were talking about the peasants in Russia, sir, in 1904. The Communists did not produce this play. Nobody wanted such a play.

The CHAIRMAN. You say the Communists did not produce it? It was produced by a man who was living with a Communist, who belonged to a Communist organization. Is that right?

Mr. KAGHAN. I did not produce it, sir. I wrote it.

The CHAIRMAN. Or it was written, then, by a man who was working for an organization headed by a known Communist. Is that right?

Mr. KAGHAN. It was written by a man who—well, I assume he was a Communist, as I testified. It was written about communism. You cannot write plays about communism without quoting some Communist lines.

The CHAIRMAN. You said it was written by a man you assumed was a Communist?

Mr. KAGHAN. No; it was written by me, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you assume that you were a Communist?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Then what did you mean when you said it was written by a man you assumed was a Communist?

Mr. KAGHAN. It was a slip of the tongue, an unfinished sentence. You asked me about a man I lived with who was a Communist.

The CHAIRMAN. Who helped you write this play?

Mr. KAGHAN. I think I wrote that play entirely by myself, unless one of my instructors at the University of Michigan may have helped me a little bit in polishing, which I doubt. It is a very bad play. I would not like to blame anybody for helping me write it.

Senator DIRKSEN. Mr. Kaghan, did you say this won the Avery Hopwood prize at the University of Michigan?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, one of those prizes; when I was not yet 21.

Senator DIRKSEN. Did you know Avery Hopwood?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; I did not.

Senator DIRKSEN. Do you know what plays he wrote?

Mr. KAGHAN. I think he wrote *The Bat*.

Senator DIRKSEN. I think he wrote *Up in Mabel's Room*, which was popular on the stage.

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir. He made a lot of money, and when he died he left it to the University of Michigan to encourage young playwrights.

Senator DIRKSEN. And did he not write another play, called *Getting Gertie's Garter*, which was popular on the New York stage? This does not sound much like Hopwood to me.

Mr. KAGHAN. It was to encourage playwrights that he left this money, and it was not the kind of play Hopwood made money on, sir, and neither did I.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know who voted you this award?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't recall who the judges were.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know that Robert Morse Lovett was one of the men who voted you this award?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't recall who the judges were, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know how many fronts for the Communist Party Robert Morse Lovett belonged to?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask counsel:

Have you checked that with the Un-American Activities Committee, and do you know how many fronts he has belonged to?

Mr. COHN. Approximately 50 fronts, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it might be well to get a report from the House Un-American Activities Committee and put that in the record, a report as to the number of fronts that Robert Morse Lovett belonged to and also the number he belonged to at the time of the award.

Mr. COHN. I might say there were other judges who awarded various prizes to Mr. Kaghan for this and other plays who have Communist fronts almost as imposing as Mr. Lovett's. I think one other has been named under oath as a member of the Communist Party. Can we get a documentation on all of that and attach it as an exhibit?

The CHAIRMAN. I think it might be well to get the names of those who made the awards to Mr. Kaghan and then give their record. I believe the House committee can give you a lot of dope on that.

Mr. Kaghan, you belonged to the New Theater League, did you not?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't remember whether I belonged to it. I worked with it. I worked for it for a time, I think. And I associated closely with it.

Senator MUNDT. Did they produce that play, Mr. Kaghan?

Mr. KAGHAN. They did not produce that play, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you know, when you were working for the New Theater League, that the head of it was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. KAGHAN. I assumed that he was; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In fact, you lived with him, did you not?

Mr. KAGHAN. I lived with him for a year or less, sir.

Senator MUNDT. Is that Mr. Irwin?

Mr. KAGHAN. That is Mr. Irwin.

Senator MUNDT. You have already testified you knew he was a Communist.

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes; he was helping me get into the theater, I thought, and that is why I stuck around.

The CHAIRMAN. When you wrote this play Beyond Exile, were you then working for the New Theater League?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; I was in the University of Michigan as a sophomore.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kaghan, when we asked you a question the other day—I have discussed this with a number of the Senators since then—we asked you to name some of the other men whom you associated with during those years, at the time you were living with this man you say you assumed was a Communist, when you were writing for this Communist organization; the names of some of the other men that you at that time or now think were members of the Communist Party. Your memory was extremely bad. You could not think of a single individual except Irwin, who had been exposed as a Communist. May I say that you certainly will not convince me and I do not think you will convince any other individual here that you have actually broken with the Communist Party unless you come forth now

very freely and give us the names of the other individuals with whom you were associated. You have testified, for example, that there were meetings held at the home in which you lived, lived with a man you knew to be a Communist. Your memory is bad. You cannot think of a single one of their names. I am sure there is not a single person in this room but what would remember some of the people he was associated with in 1939 or 1938; and, especially in view of the fact that you were selected by Mr. Acheson or someone in the old State Department to lead the fight against communism in Europe, it seems your memory should be good enough so that you could think of one name of someone who has not been exposed already as a Communist. Is your memory still as bad as it was the other day?

Mr. KAGHAN. Sir, the implication that I had any Communist Party to break with is one I reject. I was never a member of the Communist Party, as I testified. I have shown here I was not even as close to communism as you had me thinking for a while. I didn't have to move to break away from anything. I just moved away from the associations. And I have here a letter from the people with whom I worked in that period.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, will you answer my question? You signed a petition in which you pledged to support a Communist candidate. That was after the Hitler-Stalin Pact. You have lived with a Communist. My question is now: Can you give us the name of one individual that you thought then or think now was a Communist? You said you attended, I believe, roughly a dozen meetings, Communist meetings. I would like to know who was there, and whether you went to the FBI and gave the FBI the names of the members who attended those meetings. I know many of them attended under false names, but even then it would help. You have not done that, have you?

Mr. KAGHAN. I do not remember the names of those people. If I saw them, I might remember I knew them.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it correct that a Communist organization produced some of your plays?

Mr. KAGHAN. A Communist-front organization apparently produced one of my plays, which was a one-act play.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you say that was a rejection of communism?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; I would not say it was a rejection of communism. I would say that play probably aided the Communists, because it glorified the Abraham Lincoln Brigade which was fighting Fascists in Spain, and the Communists were using antifascism as a cover. I regret that it helped them, if it did help them any. That is the one play that a Communist-front organization produced.

But you quoted from another play. Can I quote a few lines back from that other play?

Senator JACKSON. Would you be willing to give a list of names of people that you knew at these meetings in executive session, so that the names will not be made public, until an opportunity is had to examine them?

Mr. KAGHAN. Sir, I don't recall enough meetings. I don't believe I admitted I went to a dozen meetings, and most of those meetings were large meetings, and I don't remember the names of people who were at them. I wasn't that much interested.

Senator JACKSON. Would you supply that information in executive session, so that no individual might be named who might be innocent in any wise, so that the committee can investigate the names based on description or some other means that we could turn over to the FBI, and run it down, and find out who they are?

Mr. KAGHAN. Sir, if the committee could provide me in executive session with a list of names of people they suspect as being Communists that I might have known, and if I remember any of those names, I will be glad to identify them. I do not recall them.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Kaghlan, the committee cannot give you a list of the names. We were not at those Communist meetings. You were there. You told us that you did not know whether it was more or less than 12 meetings. You told us they were meetings in your home. Now, I do not think you can get any reasonable man to believe that you cannot think of a single name, of all those individuals you met.

Senator JACKSON. If you cannot supply the names in executive session, would you try to provide a description of some of the individuals, what their background might have been and what they were doing, without regard to their names, so that we may have some general information, if nothing else?

Mr. KAGHAN. I couldn't give you a list of names.

Senator JACKSON. That is not my question.

Mr. KAGHAN. I beg your pardon.

Senator JACKSON. My question is pretty clear, I think.

Mr. KAGHAN. The only way I could be of any assistance would be to say that the people who worked in the New Theater League might have been leftists, might have been deluded as I was, might have been Communists. I don't know. But if you will look at the cast of characters, of people who played in the play that that organization produced, you might find somebody that I will remember. I don't remember anybody who played in that.

Senator JACKSON. My question is very simple. Would you be willing to supply to the committee in executive session a description of one or more of these people who attended these 7 or 8 meetings that you attended, something that you can identify them with, background, information? How many people were in these meetings?

Mr. KAGHAN. Some of these meetings were large meetings, that probably may have been controlled by the Communist Party.

Senator JACKSON. Is it not true that some of the meetings in the apartment were small?

Mr. KAGHAN. I did not say there were meetings in my apartment, or his apartment. I said there were people in, and I do not remember their names.

Senator JACKSON. Can you describe them, something about their background, what they did or where they came from?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir. I do not remember any of them. I was not that intimately associated with his friends who came on such occasions. I had one-half of the apartment, and he had another, and I was not always there.

I am willing to go over a list of names of people that I associated with in the New Theater League, whose names I, at this moment, do not remember, and check off those that might be of some assistance to the committee.

Senator JACKSON. What other group besides the New Theater League might provide a clue?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't know that I belonged to any other groups.

Senator JACKSON. I do not mean that you belonged to; that you might have attended.

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't recall what I attended, under what group, or under what auspices.

Senator MUNDT. You mentioned the Abraham Lincoln Brigade. Do you recall one of them?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't recall that I ever attended an official meeting of the brigade, or that I joined. I remember that I contributed funds. I remember that I had a pin. I don't recall any specific meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you ever solicited to join the Communist Party?

Mr. KAGHAN. I may have been. I do not recall that I was.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not recall whether you were or not?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir. It is entirely likely. I went to a lot of meetings where all kinds of papers were passed around. I could have signed something that was. I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you do not want to say at this time that you did not sign an application for membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; I may have.

The CHAIRMAN. But you mean that was so unimportant to you that you would not remember whether you had applied for membership in the party?

Mr. KAGHAN. In the days of this so-called united front, I could have signed a number of things, and one of them could have been that.

The CHAIRMAN. You are talking about the united front. Let us talk about after the Hitler-Stalin pact had been signed. You would not call those days, days of the united front, would you?

Mr. KAGHAN. I beg your pardon?

The CHAIRMAN. You were talking about what you might have done during what you call the united front. What do you mean by that?

Mr. KAGHAN. Oh, there was a lot of psychological warfare being waged here by the Soviets to get the United States to be sympathetic to Soviet Russia.

Senator JACKSON. The united front ended in August of 1939, did it not?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't know, sir. I couldn't give you a date.

Senator MUNDT. On another point, Mr. Kaghan, one of the things that you were going to try to find for us between the hearings was some documentary evidence demonstrating that you had had a change of attitude between these days when you were associated with the united front and the time when you were first employed by the Government: not afterward, not in 1946, when you were fighting communism in Austria. We have those letters, those testimonials. We are curious to find out how much laxity there was on the part of the Government in those days in employing people. And by your own testimony, you had a great number of associations with the Communist Party, with the Communists, and you lived with a Communist in 1939. You went to work for the Government, as I recall, in about 1944?

Mr. KAGHAN. 1942, sir.

Senator MUNDT. 1942. You were going to try to find, and thought maybe you could, some articles you had written, some statements you had made, something documentary, which would have been good evidence to the Government at the time they hired you that you had had this change of heart?

Mr. KAGHAN. I have found something. It is not something I wrote. But I went to work in the Tribune in 1939, on the war desk, and I was in intimate and daily association with various people on the war desk, which was a political operation and a war operation. And I have a letter here from the man with whom I was most closely associated on that desk, of the Herald Tribune, and with your permission I would like to read what he says about what I thought.

In response to the request from the Senate subcommittee—

The CHAIRMAN. What is the date of the letter?

Mr. KAGHAN. The letter is dated May 2.

The CHAIRMAN. 1953?

Mr. KAGHAN. 1953. I asked him if he remembered what I was like in those days.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. KAGHAN. And he comes up with this:

* * * I can certainly attest that during our close working and social relationship during a good part of that period your views, as expressed in lengthy conversations between us, bore no resemblance whatever to the line followed by the Communists on the major issues of the time.

We first met in September 1939, when you joined the cable desk of the Herald Tribune, where I was already working. I don't recall the date of our first meeting away from the office on a social basis, but I suspect it was about a year later, since it began with a visit to introduce our wives at your apartment in Jackson Heights. In any event, there was ample opportunity from September 1939 to my departure in June 1942, to discuss at length and with candor the international events with which we were dealing.

Unfortunately, as it would now appear, a man does not normally keep a record of the bull sessions in which he engages with colleagues. Even without such a record, however, I recall the identity of our views on issues which would seem to be pertinent to the question raised by the subcommittee. For example, I can remember clearly your genuinely indignant attitude toward anyone who thought it was possible to strike a bargain with the Nazis after they had started into Poland and failed to realize that our interests were very closely tied in with those of the British. And you certainly were as jubilant as anyone around the office over the destruction of the *Graf Spee* by the British Navy, an event which I remember because the critical part of the action occurred on my birthday, and we were both handling copy on the story.

You also were as outspokenly bitter as any of us at the cold brutality of the Russian attack on Finland. All this was during an era when the Communists and their apologists were crying loudly about the "imperialist war" and arguing frantically to keep us out of it. Certainly, if you were with them, it seems to me that you could not have helped giving some sign of it in the many animated conversations with your friends, and you would not have been able to laugh as hard as you did at the Communist flip when Hitler attacked Russia.

On the basis of these recollections, I can repeat my strong personal feeling that you neither sympathized with nor followed the Communist line during the period under question. I hope that this may help both the subcommittee and yourself in clarifying the point.

This is signed by Kenyon Kilbon, K-i-l-b-o-n, a former cable editor of the Herald Tribune.

Senator MUNDT. What is he doing now, Mr. Kaghan?

Mr. KAGHAN. He is working in the Department of State, sir.

Senator MUNDT. I am trying to find out something that could have been brought to the attention of your employers in the Government to

show that there had been a change, from the time when you signed this Communist petition. Quite obviously a letter dated this month would not have been available to them then.

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir, but those people were available to them that knew how I talked and how I thought. And there is a letter here signed by another man, signed by a man on the war desk of the Tribune, who is presently still on the Tribune as a telegraph editory.

Senator MUNDT. Were either of these men interrogated before you accepted employment with the Government?

Mr. KAGHAN. I do not know, sir.

Senator MUNDT. Could you find out? It is quite possible they did talk to them.

Mr. KAGHAN. That would be a security matter. I am afraid I could not find out. I could ask them.

Senator MUNDT. They would know?

Mr. KAGHAN. They would know. I don't know whether they were asked or not. I am sure somebody on the newspaper must have been asked.

Senator JACKSON. Did you edit anything during that period?

Mr. KAGHAN. I edited everything that was given to me to edit. I edited all kinds of copy coming from abroad.

Senator JACKSON. I mean that is presently identifiable.

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir. I edited news of every description from abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask you a question? You just said that you attended some meeting with your wife and the wife of some man on the desk. Our file reflects only one marriage. That was in 1950. I am wondering how you could attend a meeting with your wife in 1942.

Mr. KAGHAN. I was previously married, sir. I was married in 1949, and that accounted in part for my moving away from my previous associations.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not interested in going into the marriage.

Mr. KAGHAN. You asked me about it.

The CHAIRMAN. I was just curious to know: Our file shows you were only married in 1950. I was curious when you said you had attended a meeting with your wife in 1942. But you were married earlier.

Mr. KAGHAN. I was married. My wife died. You will find it in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. What is her name?

Mr. KAGHAN. What was her name? Her name was Isabelle Dudley.

The CHAIRMAN. She lived at 605 West 112th Street?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes; she did.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you know a Willa Gray Martin who lived at that address?

Mr. KAGHAN. I recall the name; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. She lived with your wife before you married her?

Mr. KAGHAN. She lived in the same building.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you attend Communist meetings with Willa Gray Martin?

Mr. KAGHAN. Not to my knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you attend meetings with Willa Gray Martin?

Mr. KAGHAN. I do not recall any meetings. I may have gone to some meeting with her. I do not recall.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know whether you did or not?

Mr. KAGHAN. I do not know whether I did or not.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say positively now that you did not attend any meetings you knew were Communist meetings with Willa Gray Martin?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir, I would not say that. I do not remember any kind of meeting that I may have gone to. I will admit I may have gone to meetings with her.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us get it down to the question. Do you say now under oath that even though you may have attended meetings, you never attended a meeting with her which you knew at that time was a Communist meeting?

Mr. KAGHAN. I cannot say that under oath. I may have done it.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know how many meetings you attended with Willa Gray Martin?

Mr. KAGHAN. I do not, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The other day you told us you were not a man who normally liked to go to meetings; that you disliked that activity. Therefore, I assume that you did not go to meetings too freely. You must have had some reason to go to these meetings with Willa Gray Martin. Can you tell us what that reason was?

Mr. KAGHAN. I couldn't remember what that specific reason was, but in those days there were a lot of interesting things going on, and I probably went to some meetings about various matters going on in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. I think Mr. Jackson asked you an excellent question, and that was whether you could describe the background of some of these individuals who attended some of those meetings to the extent that it might be of some help to the FBI. But I understand now the only people you are willing to describe are the list of the members of the New Theater League. Or could you follow Mr. Jackson's suggestion and try to give the description or the background of some of these people, where they were, what they did? Is your memory bad on that, too?

Mr. KAGHAN. I would have to see the names, and then I might remember something about them.

The CHAIRMAN. Unless we give you the names, you cannot remember them?

Mr. KAGHAN. Unless you give me something to start with, I don't think I can recall the background or the names. The name of Willa Gray Martin I have not heard for years. I remember the name now that you mention it.

The CHAIRMAN. You could not give us one name from that time?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you know a Gladys Ruth Green?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't recall that name.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you know a lady named Grace?

Mr. KAGHAN. It is likely.

The CHAIRMAN. Did she not attend some of the meetings in the apartment shared by you and—

Mr. KAGHAN. I do not know who Grace is.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, if we identify her as a close friend of Ben Irwin's, will that help you?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; not unless I had a picture of her face in front of me.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not recall any of these meetings held in the apartment—we will call them gatherings—when one of the women rather active in the meetings was a woman called Grace?

Mr. KAGHAN. It is likely, sir. I do not say it isn't so. I don't remember her.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you remember a member of the Communist Party who was referred to in the meetings as Grace?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't recall, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did Mr. Irwin ever tell you that the Communist Party members had names other than their own which they are known by as members of the party?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't remember that he ever told me that, but I assume some people did.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever discuss with Ben Irwin his Communist activities?

Mr. KAGHAN. Not in detail. I don't recall any specific discussion of anything he did within the party. He didn't, as I recall, go into his party activities. He talked about the things surrounding it.

The CHAIRMAN. You say you never did discuss the Communist Party with Irwin?

Mr. KAGHAN. Oh, I must have discussed the Communist Party with Irwin; yes, sir. His activities within the party I don't recall that he discussed with me.

The CHAIRMAN. Did Irwin ever ask you to join the party?

Mr. KAGHAN. I do not recall that he did. He may have.

The CHAIRMAN. He may have?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But you are not sure?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir. I think it is probably likely, but I am not sure that he did.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever contribute any money to either Mr. Irwin or to the Communist Party or to any Communist front?

Mr. KAGHAN. I probably did contribute some money to Communist-front organizations. I don't recall giving any money directly to the Communist Party, and if I gave Irwin any money I don't recall it. It isn't unlikely. But he had a steady job, and I didn't, so it isn't likely that I gave him any.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you this, Mr. Kaghan. Let us forget for the time being that your name is Kaghan. Let us say that you had the job of hiring a man to work in the Government, and you had your record up to 1939 as it is. And nothing between 1939 and 1942, yet, which shows that you had any change in your thinking. Would you hire a man like Kaghan?

Mr. KAGHAN. Sir, my thinking shows, from the plays I read, that I was not in favor of communism in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you would hire someone to fight communism on the basis of these plays?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir. I would have tried to find out if the man knew that communism was an international conspiracy and not just a political movement, which I thought it was.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, if he were so naive that he did not know what communism was, would you hire him to combat communism?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir. I would not. I was not hired for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. In 1942 you were hired. You got a job in the Government.

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. If you were doing the hiring, would you have hired a man with a record like Kaghan had?

Mr. KAGHAN. After security check I could have; yes. I wouldn't say that I wouldn't hire myself. I was interested in fighting totalitarianism, sir, and that is what the Government hired me for.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you say "after security check." If the security check showed all the Communist activities that you had indulged in, and showed no positive action that indicated that you ever were against communism, would you have hired Kaghan?

Mr. KAGHAN. That is a difficult question, sir. At that time, sir—I can't project myself back into those days when the war was against the Germans.

The CHAIRMAN. How well did you know Joe Barnes?

Mr. KAGHAN. I would not call Joe Barnes an intimate friend of mine. He was an associate.

The CHAIRMAN. How well did you know Joe Barnes?

Mr. KAGHAN. I beg your pardon, sir?

The CHAIRMAN. How well did you know Joe Barnes? Did you meet him socially?

Mr. KAGHAN. I think I may have met him once socially.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you visit at his home?

Mr. KAGHAN. I think I went to his home once, but I wouldn't be prepared to swear to it.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you swear it was no more than once?

Mr. KAGHAN. No; I cannot swear to it that it was no more than once, but I don't recollect any more than one visit, in a place that may have been his home. I remember him without his coat on. That is all I can think of.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he ever visit in your home?

Mr. KAGHAN. Not that I can recall.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you meet him in other people's homes?

Mr. KAGHAN. I do not think so. It is possible, but I do not recall it.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he get your job for you on the desk of the Herald Tribune?

Mr. KAGHAN. I do not know how much he had to do with it, sir. I was interviewed by the city editor.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you talk with him about the job before you got it?

Mr. KAGHAN. I do not remember whether I did. I don't think I knew him.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you consider Barnes a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You did not?

Mr. KAGHAN. It never occurred to me.

The CHAIRMAN. When did it first occur to you?

Mr. KAGHAN. It never occurred to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know that a number of witnesses have identified him under oath as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. KAGHAN. If it is in the record, sir, and you say so, I am prepared to believe it. I don't know, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you not ever heard about that?

Mr. KAGHAN. I have heard things about Joe Barnes. I have seen his name in the papers. I don't recall specifically whether he was a member or accused of being a member.

The CHAIRMAN. You have a great deal of material you want to put in, there?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir, only if I am asked.

The CHAIRMAN. You may put in anything you care to.

Mr. KAGHAN. You talked about another play, Unfinished Picture, which takes the same line, and I ask that it be made a part of the record. It shows throughout that communism has no place in America. It is also about the problem of communism.

Senator JACKSON. What is the date of that play?

Mr. KAGHAN. That play was produced in 1935.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you say that is an anti-Communist play?

Mr. KAGHAN. I would say this play would not help the Communists at all, and I would like to read a couple of lines from it.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether it was favorably reviewed by the Communist press?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't know. I know it was reviewed by the University of Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you made any search so that you can find out which of these plays were favorably reviewed by the Daily Worker or any other Communist paper?

Mr. KAGHAN. You told me that—

The CHAIRMAN. Did you hear my question? I said, have you made any search so that you can tell me which plays were favorably reviewed by Communist publications or produced by Communist fronts?

Mr. KAGHAN. I have not searched Communist publications, sir. No, sir. I have no way of doing that. I have looked at the plays, and find they are not favorable to communism, and couldn't have been approved by the Communists.

The CHAIRMAN. You tell us today under oath that this play, Unfinished Picture, is not favorable to the Communist cause?

Mr. KAGHAN. In my interpretation of it, it is a rejection of communism for the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. You would like to have that marked as an exhibit?

Mr. KAGHAN. I would like to have the entire play put in as an exhibit, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be received.

(The play, Unfinished Picture, was marked "Exhibit No. 13," and may be found in the files of the subcommittee.)

Senator JACKSON. What is the part you have reference to?

Mr. KAGHAN. I have lines from the beginning to the end, but only a couple of pages of it.

Senator JACKSON. I mean the part you said was anti-Communist.

Mr. KAGHAN. Well, the father talking to his daughter, who has joined the Young Communist League. He says:

I suppose you think communism is a blessing? Ask your Aunt Gertrude, why don't you. She's been to Russia. She knows what communism is.

And later on, when he is still talking to his daughter, trying to dissuade her from these associations, he says:

You're all wrong. There are other ways to get out of the depression, better ways. We need a little sane thinking, that's all, more careful planning, a few far-sighted men in the right places would do the trick. All we need is a little readjustment of wealth in this country. It's got to be an American plan, not a crazy foreign idea. Communism wasn't meant for this country. All it would get you is trouble.

This is a father talking to his daughter.

The CHAIRMAN. I think to keep from taking it out of context, you should read what the daughter said also.

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't have what the daughter says, sir. You read that.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think I did read what the daughter said in this place. I may have. But since you are reading what the father said, let us see what the daughter had to say, and who won the argument. She says:

To see? To see what? What is there for them to see in all that bourgeois article? It tells them to lie down and be satisfied. It takes the blood out of their veins. They need art that says, Rise up. Do something. Be a man. Throw off your chains.

Mr. KAGHAN. There is an answering line to that, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, again:

This is supposed to be the land of equal opportunity. Maybe it was once, but it isn't any more. Everybody is owned by somebody.

Senator JACKSON. Who wins the argument?

The CHAIRMAN. As usual, the Communist wins the argument. The last words, by the mother—I guess it is the mother; somebody there by the name of Alice—are:

Go down and lie among your ruins. Smell the dust and the ashes. Why don't you start burning the whole mess now? Why do you leave me to look at the wreckage? Why don't you burn it? What are you waiting for?

And here is the fadeout:

GERTRUDE. There is not enough wreckage yet, my child. We have to wait.

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes. And that fade-out is spoken by an old aunt who is a retired, disappointed, disillusioned anarchist, the one who will have nothing to do with communism, as is described previously in the play, the one who is identified as having gone to Russia and been disillusioned. And she is not talking about political philosophy. She is just wailing in disappointment.

But the answer to who won the argument, sir, comes when the son tells the sister and her Communist friends:

* * * you're fooling yourselves every day when you think you can start a revolution in this country. America isn't Russia. This country has everything it needs. A little depression, or even a big one, doesn't mean a revolution. American psychology and American traditions are different from Russia's. We'll get along without importing any crazy schemes from other countries.

And again:

You Communists get your ideas from Russia. The Russians don't know anything about the way people are here. They can't do things here the way they do them in Russia. The American people would never stand for communism.

That is the son arguing with the daughter and her Communist friends.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you claim you were anti-Communist when you wrote that?

Mr. KAGHAN. I claim I was unwilling to accept communism as a way out for America. And I have always been, and still am.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, were you against communism, as a world movement?

Mr. KAGHAN. I didn't understand communism, sir, as I discovered later. To me, communism then was a political movement. I now know it is an international conspiracy.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you tell us how you could write these brilliant anti-Communist plays if you did not understand communism and did not understand it was a danger? What impelled you to write what you call these strong anti-Communist plays?

Mr. KAGHAN. I didn't call them strong anti-Communist plays, as I recall, sir, I said they were a rejection of communism. They were about the subject of communism, about the subject of what was going on here in the United States in the 1930's, during the depression, when a lot of people were talking about communism.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you wrote these plays in 1935 and 1936; and in 1939, you swear to a petition saying, "I intend to support at the coming election the Communist candidate."

This is in 1939. I am wondering how you were against communism in 1935 and if something happened so that you got a little soft toward it in 1939.

Mr. KAGHAN. Sir, I was associating with people I knew to be Communists. I had a case of political chickenpox which I think you are trying to make into a case of incurable political disease of some kind.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kaghan, I am not trying to make it into anything. I find a man who seems to have followed the pattern of the old State Department that you were working in, a pattern of a man with a background of Communist associations, Communist connections, who says, "But I have reformed." It seems he claims to have reformed sometime after he got in the State Department.

Mr. KAGHAN. I could not claim to have reformed, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I find you holding an extremely important job over in Germany, spending \$61 million. You seem to object to our checking into your background, finding out whether you still believe the way you did.

Mr. KAGHAN. I thank you for checking into my background. I thank you for the opportunity I have had to check into it myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Pardon me for interrupting. I think you were putting more material in the record.

Mr. KAGHAN. You want to know why the Department hired me. I was hired not by the Department of State but by Mr. John McCoy and Mr. Ralph Nicholson, who were in Germany at the time. Mr. Nicholson came and hired me, and Mr. Nicholson sent me this telegram last night. It is very short.

I have continuously believed in your loyalty and your effectiveness in combating communism from the time of our first meeting in Vienna in 1949, where I went to persuade you to come to Public Affairs, HICOG, of which I was director. Throughout our association, your performance was most satisfactory in every respect. You lived up to your splendid reputation—

which was for fighting communism—

and justified my confidence and high regard.

That is signed, "Ralph Nicholson, president and publisher, Charlotte Observer."

That was not a State Department man, although he was working under that.

You talked about the Neue Zeitung, sir. We put out a Neue Zeitung in Berlin. Here is a sample of the Neue Zeitung we put out in Berlin. Here is the Neue Zeitung. It is that big [indicating]. It is a weekly put out for distribution behind the Iron Curtain. If you roll it up, it is no bigger than a cigarette. That is one of the things the Neue Zeitung does, and that is one of the things I am doing in Germany.

We put out pamphlets by all kinds of people who will be familiar to you. There is Ruth Fischer, Ignazio Silone, Koestler, Sidney Hook. Things like that are what we are doing in Germany now to fight communism.

The CHAIRMAN. You said the Neue Zeitung was a weekly?

Mr. KAGHAN. This is one of the weekly editions. It is a daily in Berlin, and in Frankfurt it has another form. This is its regular form, which comes out daily 6 days a week. This is the one that is edited by Hans Wallenberg, who was mentioned here before.

This one is put out by Mike Fodor up in Berlin.

The CHAIRMAN. Let's stop at Wallenberg, for a minute. Do you consider him a Communist?

Mr. KAGHAN. I consider him a very loyal and able American who is doing a tremendous job in Germany.

The CHAIRMAN. Now will you answer the question?

Mr. KAGHAN. I do not consider him a Communist.

The CHAIRMAN. Had you heard that he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. KAGHAN. I have just heard some stuff here.

The CHAIRMAN. Before today?

Mr. KAGHAN. That he was a member of the Communist Party? No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You say "a member of the Communist Party." Let us not draw any fine lines. Had you heard before today that he was a Communist; that he followed the Communist line? I do not refer to joining the party. Had you heard that?

Mr. KAGHAN. I had heard some derogatory information about him; yes. He told me there was some derogatory information, and I may have heard it from somewhere else.

The CHAIRMAN. By "derogatory information," you mean derogatory along the line of Communist activity?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; it wasn't in that form.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, what form was it in, then?

Mr. KAGHAN. It was in the form of being not anti-Communist, or not having been anti-Communist, or something like that. It was nothing as definite as being a Communist.

The CHAIRMAN. And you say that he told you that his files showed that?

Mr. KAGHAN. He didn't tell me that; no, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What did he tell you?

Mr. KAGHAN. He once mentioned that somebody was presenting derogatory information about him and he wanted to do something about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you aware of the fact that all these well-known Communists mentioned by the previous witness were writing for the Neue Zeitung?

Mr. KAGHAN. No, sir; that was before I got there. But there are two editors of the Neue Zeitung who were there at the time, one in Munich, where we published an edition, and one in Frankfurt, where we published another edition, who are in this room now and will be prepared to testify in rebuttal of the testimony this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it your statement that they will testify that those Communists were not hired on the paper?

Mr. KAGHAN. I do not know what they will testify. I was not there.

The CHAIRMAN. You said they will testify in rebuttal. Have you talked to them?

Mr. KAGHAN. I was told they would like to testify in rebuttal about the charges brought up this morning against Mr. Wallenberg.

The CHAIRMAN. Who told you?

Mr. KAGHAN. Who told me?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. You said you were told.

Mr. KAGHAN. One of the men told me.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us get their names. If they want to testify, they will be allowed to.

Mr. KAGHAN. One is Mr. Alfred Jacobson.

The CHAIRMAN. And he told you he would like to testify?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And who is the other one?

Mr. KAGHAN. Mr. Max Kraus.

The CHAIRMAN. And they are in the room today?

Mr. KAGHAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. They will be allowed to testify.

Mr. Kraus and Mr. Jacobson, you will consider yourselves under subpoena. Are you here in the room?

Mr. JACOBSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand you both want to testify?

Mr. JACOBSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And Mr. Jacobson?

Mr. KRAUS. This is Mr. Jacobson. I am Mr. Kraus.

The CHAIRMAN. Which is Mr. Kraus?

Mr. KRAUS. I am Kraus.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to hear from you. We will not be able to hear from you today. We have Mr. Wechsler in executive session in about an hour and a half. So, we will not be able to hear from you today, but counsel will arrange a hearing at the earliest convenience. Are you merely in the United States temporarily?

Mr. JACOBSON. Pardon, sir?

The CHAIRMAN. Are you here merely temporarily? In other words, how much inconvenience will it be to you if you are kept here for several days?

Mr. JACOBSON. I am living in Washington, sir. No inconvenience at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you working in the State Department?

Mr. JACOBSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you are living in Washington also?

Mr. KRAUS. Yes, sir. I am also working in the State Department.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, it will not inconvenience you if you are not called tomorrow or the next day, because you will be here right along.

Mr. KRAUS. That is right, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you contact the staff of the committee at the earliest convenience, in room 101?

Proceed, Mr. Kaghan.

Mr. KAGHAN. There was some question here previously, sir, as to my loyalty and the status of it, and I wish to put into the record a letter I have from the Deputy Under Secretary, the former Deputy Under Secretary, Mr. Humelsine, who says that "There is no reasonable doubt as to your loyalty to the Government of the United States, and you do not constitute a security risk to the Department of State."

The CHAIRMAN. May I say, Mr. Kaghan, that the fact that you read letters into the record will not be considered as a precedent to other witnesses. Normally, if someone wants to appear and testify in your behalf, he must do that under oath and not by letter. However, we will allow you to put in those letters you have, in view of the fact that you were not notified on that.

What is the date of that letter, incidentally?

Mr. KAGHAN. October 27, 1952.

The CHAIRMAN. October 27, 1952. What was the occasion of your getting that letter?

Mr. KAGHAN. The occasion was interrogatories based on the material which gave rise to the questions that I have been asked here.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Mr. KAGHAN. There was some question also, sir, about the kind of anti-Communist material I produced in Austria, which led the State Department to hire me in Germany. Would you care to have some excerpts from the material I wrote then?

The CHAIRMAN. You will have complete freedom to put anything you care to into the record. If the material is too voluminous—

Mr. KAGHAN. It is rather voluminous.

The CHAIRMAN. We will mark it as an exhibit instead of putting it into the record. You may put in anything you care to.

Mr. KAGHAN. I also have in pamphlets here material which we are producing in Germany. I was brought to Germany, and organized this pamphlet operation.

The CHAIRMAN. I wonder if you would have Ruth, here, mark those. Mark all the exhibits that you want to offer. Will you pass those over to her?

Mr. KAGHAN. I will pass them over to her. May I straighten them out later, sir? They are rather mixed up.

The CHAIRMAN. Why don't you do this? Why don't you go down and see the young lady this afternoon in room 101 and give her everything you want marked as an exhibit? May I say, if there are some excerpts that you feel strongly should be in the record instead of merely being an exhibit, we will try and accommodate you on that. But it would be impossible to have all that material in the record. However, all will be received as exhibits.

Mr. KAGHAN. Most of these are anti-Communist, exposing Communist control of the youth, exposing the fraud of the Stockholm peace petition—

The CHAIRMAN. And you say you put those out?

Mr. KAGHAN. I say I am responsible for getting this whole setup organized to put these out, and get them behind the Iron Curtain through underground means; 300,000, 200,000, some of them 500,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you are responsible for all of the books that are put out?

Mr. KAGHAN. I am not responsible for all. I was not at the time I did this. I am, as Acting Deputy Director, responsible for anything that goes on in the Office of Public Affairs. But that book that was mentioned this morning was before my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. Have you checked to find out who was responsible for putting out those books by Communist authors?

Mr. KAGHAN. I have not personally checked, but an investigation was made while I was in Germany, and the results were given to the security people.

The CHAIRMAN. So that the people responsible for putting out the Communist books as far as you know are still working under you?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't know that, sir. I don't know who was responsible for it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Mr. Riedel still working in your Department?

Mr. KAGHAN. Who, sir?

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. John Riedel.

Mr. KAGHAN. Riedel, I think, sir, is the name.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he still working in your department?

Mr. KAGHAN. He was still at work when I left Germany. I understood he had resigned.

The CHAIRMAN. So as far as you know, the people responsible for putting out this Communist publication may or may not be still working for you?

Mr. KAGHAN. I don't know how much responsibility any particular person had. I have not seen a complete report.

The CHAIRMAN. If you have finished your oral testimony, we will adjourn now and allow you to add whatever material you care to in the record.

(Material subsequently filed by Mr. Kaghan was marked as "Exhibit No. 14," and may be found in the files of the subcommittee.)

The CHAIRMAN. We will have a public hearing tomorrow morning at 10:30 in room 318.

(Whereupon, at 12:35 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, May 6, 1953.)

APPENDIX

EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT No. 11

UNITED STATES WRITER GIVEN EAST ZONE ASYLUM—HEYM CALLS AMERICA WARLIKE AND FASCIST—TAKES FAMILY TO HIS NATIVE GERMANY

BERLIN, April 15.—Stefan Heym, a naturalized American author who won a Bronze Star fighting in the Battle of the Bulge, has taken his family to Communist East Germany, where he was born, and has asked for asylum there, the official East German news agency ADN reported tonight.

It quoted him as having said: "The warlike and fascistic policy of the present American Government makes it impossible for an honest man to be an author in America and publish his works there."

Mr. Heym, who has written several books, among them *The Eyes of Reason*, *Hostages*, *The Crusaders*, and *Of Smiling Peace*, was said to have given as an added reason for having left the United States the fact that he had faced a call to active duty as an Army officer.

He did not want to serve in the Army, the statement said, because it was recruiting "convicted Nazi war criminals" and employing bacteriological weapons. He said he had sent his Bronze Star and his Army commission to President Eisenhower.

ADN said the East German Government had restored Mr. Heym's former German citizenship. He was born in Chemnitz, now in the Soviet Zone of Germany, in 1913.

In the statement Mr. Heym asserted that he hoped to find in East Germany those "personal rights" that, he said, were lacking in the United States.

SUCCESSFUL WRITER IN UNITED STATES

From the time that Stefan Heym emigrated to the United States from Prague, Czechoslovakia, in 1935, he won a good reputation here as an author and journalist.

Granted a graduate scholarship at the University of Chicago, he received his M. A. degree there in 1936, and in the next year accepted the editorship of a small German anti-Nazi weekly, *Deutsches Volksecho*, published in New York. He helped expose the activities of the Nazi Bund in America and in 1938 he published a pamphlet, *Nazis in the U. S. A.*

From 1939 until the publication of *Hostages* in 1942, he worked as a printing salesman. The reviewers agreed on the whole that *Hostages* was a hair-raising and "terrifying effective narrative." The New York Times reviewer, Orville Prescott, called it the best novel he had seen about life under the Nazis.

In 1943, Mr. Heym entered the Army as a private and later was a lieutenant in psychological warfare. His latest book, *The Crusaders*, published here in September 1948, was dedicated to his wife Gertrude, who wrote for magazines as Valerie Stone.

The Heyms lived in Peter Cooper Village in late 1948. One of his literary associates here reported yesterday that he went to France about 3 years ago.

SUPPLEMENTAL DATA

No. 1

Information from the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities, United States House of Representatives.

Date: May 7, 1953.

For: Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Subject: Robert Morss Lovett.

Public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning Robert Morss Lovett. This report should not be construed as representing results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the subject individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Following is an excerpt from the American Peace Crusader for May 1951 (p. 2), a publication of the American Peace Crusade:

"CHICAGO.—Illinois assembly of American Peace Crusade is taking its role as host to the peace congress seriously. Thousands of ballots are in circulation. An Illinois peace assembly, with Professor Lovett and Rev. Joseph Evans as honorary cochairmen, launched."

The Illinois peace assembly has never been cited as subversive or Communist by this committee or by any other official investigative agency; however, the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American Peace Crusade as an organization which "the Communists established" as "a new instrument for their 'peace' offensive in the United States" and which was heralded by the Daily Worker "with the usual bold headlines reserved for projects in line with the Communist objectives." (Statement on the March of Treason, February 19, 1951, and H. Rept. No. 378 on the Communist Peace Offensive, released April 1, 1951.)

The Daily Worker of March 6, 1951 (p. 4), reported that "Prof. Robert Morss Lovett, prominent educator and former Governor of the Virgin Islands, has announced the formation of a Chicago committee of the American Peace Crusade. The committee will send a delegation of 250 Chicagoans to participate in the national 'pilgrimage for peace' in Washington, D. C., March 15. The committee was formed at a supper meeting of 40 ministers, labor leaders, and others. * * * It was sponsored by Professor Lovett, Rev. Joseph M. Evans * * * all national sponsors of the American Peace Crusade."

The Daily People's World of March 16, 1951 (p. 1), reported that Robert Morss Lovett led a delegation of the American Peace Crusade to Washington, D. C. In its report on the Communist "peace" offensive, the Committee on Un-American Activities devoted several pages to the activities of the American Peace Crusade, from which the following excerpts are quoted:

"Two projects adopted almost immediately by the new front organization were a 'peace pilgrimage' to Washington, D. C., and a nationwide 'peace poll.' Both boldly called for American surrender to Communist aggression, and for betrayal of American boys fighting in Korea. As announced in the Daily Worker of February 1, 1951, the 'peace pilgrimage' was scheduled to descend upon Washington in March to demand from Congress and the executive agencies of the Government that the Americans 'abandon the futile conflict in Korea' and recognize the 'right' of the Chinese Communists to sit in the United Nations. * * *

"The 'peace' pilgrimage concluded with a public rally. * * * A militant call to treason was clearly sounded at this rally, which was addressed by such individuals as * * * Prof. Robert Morss Lovett * * *" (pp. 52 and 53).

Other references to Mr. Lovett in connection with the American Peace Crusade appear in the following sources: He sponsored a contest of the organization, advancing the theme of world peace (Daily Worker of May 1, 1951, p. 11); sponsor, American People's Congress and Exposition for Peace, Chicago, Ill. (as shown on the call to that congress); elected cochairman of the American People's Congress * * * (Daily Worker, July 3, 1951, p. 2); announced speaker at meeting of active peace workers on January 11 in Chicago, under the auspices of the American Peace Crusade (Daily Worker of January 7, 1952, p. 2); signed

the organization's petition calling on President Truman and Congress to seek a big-power pact (*Daily Worker*, February 1, 1952, p. 1); honorary chairman of the Illinois assembly, American Peace Crusade (letterhead dated April 12, 1951).

The Daily People's World of March 3, 1952 (p. 4), reported that Dr. Lovett was one of the sponsors of the delegation that marched on Washington, D. C., April 1, of the National Delegates Assembly for Peace, identified in the Daily People's World (March 21, 1952, p. 2), as a meeting of the American Peace Crusade. The Daily Worker of March 24, 1952 (p. 2), named him as Illinois State cochairman of the American Peace Crusade and guest of honor at the organization's banquet, March 8, in Chicago. He signed the organization's open letter to the President of the United States, demanding immediate cease-fire in Korea with prisoner issue to be settled later; he was identified in this source (*Daily Worker* of March 11, 1953, p. 8), as former Governor of the Virgin Islands, professor emeritus of English literature at the University of Chicago. The Worker (Sunday edition of the Daily Worker) reported on March 22, 1953 (p. 4), that Dr. Lovett welcomed 76 delegates to a national policy meeting of the American Peace Crusade which met in Chicago March 14 and 15.

The Daily Worker of November 3, 1936 (p. 4), reported that Robert Morss Lovett participated in a Communist Party meeting which was held in Madison Square Garden.

From 1934 until 1939 Robert Morss Lovett was associated with the American League Against War and Fascism, later known as the American League for Peace and Democracy, as shown by the following: He signed the call for a United Front Conference on February 10-11, 1934, Chicago, Ill., held under the auspices of the American League Against War and Fascism (*Fight* magazine for February 1934, p. 15); he was chairman of the Second United States Congress Against War and Fascism (a letterhead of the group dated August 30, 1934); he signed the call to the second congress which was held in Chicago, September 28-30, 1934. In 1935, Dr. Lovett was named on a letterhead of the American League Against War and Fascism, dated August 22, 1935, as a member of that organization's national executive committee. *Fight* magazine for September 1935 (p. 13), named him as vice chairman of the group. He was a member of the Chicago executive committee of the League, as shown on their letterhead dated May 16, 1936; he contributed to *Fight* magazine for August 1936; he was vice chairman of the league in 1937 (*Fight* magazine for November 1937, p. 3; and July 1937, p. 3; also the March 1937 issue, p. 3; and a letterhead of the group dated November 3, 1937). He was a member of the national executive committee of the People's Congress for Democracy and Peace, as shown on a letterhead dated November 3, 1937; vice chairman of the organization in 1938 (*Fight* magazine for February 1938); one of the national vice chairmen in 1939 (letterhead of the American League for Peace and Democracy dated March 24, 1939; the Call to Action of the American Congress for Peace and Democracy, January 2-8, 1939, Washington, D. C.; a pamphlet entitled "7½ Million * * *" (p. 34)).

The American League Against War and Fascism was "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union": it was also cited as subversive and Communist (the Attorney General of the United States in press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948, respectively). The special committee * * * cited the American League * * * as "completely under the control of Communists" (report of March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; and June 25, 1942). The American League for Peace and Democracy was established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism "in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union"; it was also cited as subversive and Communist (the Attorney General in press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948, respectively). The special committee cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as "the largest of the Communist 'front' movements in the United States" (reports of January 3, 1939; March 29, 1944; January 3, 1940; January 3, 1941; June 25, 1942; and January 2, 1943).

Mr. Lovett was a member of the advisory board of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (letterhead of April 27, 1938; letterhead of January 1940; and the call to the third annual conference of the organization); he was a sponsor of the organization, according to a letterhead summarizing the 1946 work of the group; a letterhead of the fourth annual conference in Washington, D. C., March 2-3, 1940; a booklet entitled "The Registration of Aliens" (back cover); letterheads of December 11 and 12, 1948, and 1950; and the Daily Worker of February 12, 1948 (p. 6). He was a sponsor of the national conference of the organization in Cleveland, Ohio, October 25-26, 1947, as shown on the call for the conference and the printed program; and was cochairman of that conference (Daily Worker of August 20, 1947, p. 4). He signed the organization's letter in behalf of Communist deportation cases (Daily Worker of March 4, 1948, p. 2); he signed its statement in behalf of Gerhart Eisler (Daily Worker of December 21, 1948, p. 4); and signed a statement against denaturalization (Daily Worker, August 10, 1950, p. 5).

The call to a Midwest conference to defend the Bill of Rights and for the defense of foreign born, May 18, 1952, in Chicago, Ill., issued by the Midwest Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, named Hon. Robert Morss Lovett as one of the sponsors of that conference. The Daily Worker of February 25, 1953 (p. 8), reported that the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born announced that the Honorable Robert Morss Lovett was one of "29 prominent Americans (who) joined yesterday in a demand to Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., that he use his power to grant bail to Sam Milgrom, hospitalized Walter-McCarran victim, it was announced by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. Milgrom, executive secretary of the International Workers Order, was jailed without bail on Ellis Island on October 24, 1952." On April 8, 1953, the Daily Worker reported that Dr. Lovett had signed an open letter of the American Committee * * *, calling upon the United States Congress to repeal the Walter-McCarran law.

The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948); the special committee * * * cited it as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" (report of March 29, 1944; also cited in report dated June 25, 1942).

Professor Lovett was one of the sponsors of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions and held in New York City, March 25-27, 1949 (from the call to the conference and the printed program). A letterhead of the national council * * * dated July 28, 1950, and a leaflet entitled "Policy and Program Adopted by the National Convention, 1950," named him honorary chairman of the national council * * *. He signed the organization's statement for negotiations with the U. S. S. R. (Daily Worker of August 7, 1950, p. 8), and supported a rehearing of the case of Communist leaders before the Supreme Court (We Join Black's Dissent, a reprint of an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 20, 1951, by the national council) * * *. The Daily Worker of June 2, 1952 (p. 3), reported that he had endorsed the national council's resolution calling for a hearing of Tunisia's demands in the United Nations; a letterhead of the national council * * * dated December 7, 1952, named him as honorary chairman of the group.

A mimeographed letter, dated December 1, 1950, named Dr. Robert Morss Lovett as a member of the American Sponsoring Committee for Representation at the World Peace Congress. The Daily Worker of November 9, 1950 (p. 2), reported that he was a delegate to the World Peace Congress. A handbill entitled "Destination Peace," dated January 12, 1951, named him as an initiating sponsor of the Chicago Welcoming Committee for the Delegates to the World Peace Congress.

The Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace was cited as a Communist front which "was actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheel-horses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations"; the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions was cited as a Communist-front organization; and the World Peace Congress was cited as a Communist front among the "peace" conferences which "have been organized under Communist initiative in various countries throughout the world as part of a campaign against the North Atlantic Defense Pact" (from the committee's report of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, released April 19, 1949).

Robert Morss Lovett signed the open letter for closer cooperation with the Soviet Union, as shown in Soviet Russia Today for September 1939 (p. 25). "In September 1939, 1 month after the signing of the Nazi-Soviet pact, a group of Communist Party stooges issued an open letter * * *. It should be emphasized that the United States and the Soviet Union were not at that time collaborating for the crushing of the Axis military might. On the contrary, the Soviet Union was collaborating with the Nazis" (from a report of the special committee * * * dated June 25, 1942).

A letterhead of the medical bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy, dated November 18, 1936, contained the name of Robert Morss Lovett in a list of members of that group; he was a sponsor of the same organization according to the Daily Worker of March 5, 1937 (p. 2); he was named on a letterhead of the organization dated July 6, 1938, as a national sponsor and a member of the Chicago committee (letterhead dated April 12, 1938).

During 1937 and 1938, the Communist Party campaigned for support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing so-called relief groups such as American Friends of Spanish Democracy (from the special committee's report of March 29, 1944).

Mr. Lovett was a sponsor of the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, at which the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was established (program entitled "Call to a Conference * * *" June 7, 1940, p. 4). He also sponsored the National Action Conference for Civil Rights which was held in Washington, D. C., April 19-20, 1941, as shown on the call issued by the national federation * * *. The Attorney General of the United States cited the national federation as subversive and Communist and as an organization "by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program" (the Loyalty Review Board's press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; and the Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7687, respectively). The special committee cited the national federation as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party" (Rept. 1311 of March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of June 25, 1942, and January 2, 1943). The Committee on Un-American Activities cited the national federation as "actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law" (Rept. 1115 of September 2, 1947).

New Masses for May 3, 1938, contained an article by Professor Lovett; he signed New Masses' letter to the President of the United States, as shown in the April 2, 1940, issue of that magazine (p. 21). The Attorney General cited New Masses as a "Communist periodical" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7688). It was cited as a "nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party * * * whose ownership was vested in the American fund for Public Service" (special committee in Rept. 1311 of March 29, 1944).

A pamphlet entitled "Fight War" (p. 4), published by the Student Congress Against War, named Professor Lovett as a member of the organization's national committee; he was a member of the Advisory Board of the American Student Union, as shown on their pamphlet entitled "Presenting the American Student Union"; and was a member of the National Advisory Board of the American Youth Congress (Youngville, U. S. A., p. 63).

"During the Christmas holidays of 1932, the Student Congress Against War was convened at the University of Chicago. This gathering was held at the direct instigation of the (Amsterdam) World Congress Against War. The Chicago congress was completely controlled by the Communists of the National Student League" (special committee's report dated March 29, 1944). The American Student Union was a Communist-front organization, "the result of a united front gathering of young Socialists and Communists" in 1937. The Young Communist League took credit for creation of the union (special committee in reports of January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944). The American Youth Congress "originated in 1934 and * * * has been controlled by Communists and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth"; it was also cited as subversive and Communist (the Attorney General in the Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7685; and press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948, respectively).

The November 1937 issue of Soviet Russia Today (p. 79), published a page of signatures from the Golden Book of American Friendship With the Soviet Union, sponsored by the American Friends of the Soviet Union and "signed by hundreds of thousands of Americans. The Golden Book will be presented to President Kalinin at the 20th anniversary celebration." A facsimile of Robert Morss Lovett's signature appears on the page, which is entitled "I hereby

inscribe my name in greeting to the people of the Soviet Union on the 20th anniversary of the establishment of the Soviet Republic."

The Golden Book of American Friendship With the Soviet Union has been cited as a "Communist enterprise" signed by "hundreds of well-known Communists and fellow travelers" (special committee's report of March 29, 1944); Friends of the Soviet Union, sponsors of the Golden Book, has been cited by the Attorney General as Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, June 1, and September 21, 1948); the special committee called it "one of the most open Communist fronts in the United States" (reports of January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944).

In a report dated June 25, 1942, prepared by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, the open letter to American liberals was cited as having been published in "March 1937" by "a group of well-known Communists and Communist collaborators * * *" (which) was a defense of the Moscow purge trials." Soviet Russia Today (March 1937, pp. 14-15), named Professor Lovett as having signed the open letter to American Liberals.

Professor Lovett was a member of the National Committee of the All-American Anti-Imperialist League, as shown on their letterhead dated April 11, 1928. The All-American * * * was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Attorney General in re Harry Bridges (May 28, 1942, p. 10), and as a Communist enterprise (special committee in report of March 29, 1944).

The call to the fourth American Writers Congress which was held in New York, June 6-8, 1941, was signed by Professor Lovett, as shown on the leaflet entitled "In Defense of Culture"; he also signed a statement In Defense of Peace, prepared by the League of American Writers (the Worker of September 22, 1940, p. 7). The League of American Writers was founded "under Communist auspices in 1935 * * *" (and) in 1939 began openly to follow the Communist Party line as dictated by the foreign policy of the Soviet Union"; it was also cited as subversive and Communist (the Attorney General in the Congressional Record of September 24, 1942, pp. 7685 and 7686; and press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948, respectively). The special committee cited the league as a Communist-front organization (reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944).

The Daily Worker of February 13, 1937 (p. 2), named Mr. Lovett as having signed a cable of the Prestes Defense Committee, cited as a "Communist organization * * * defending Luiz Carlos Prestes, leading Brazilian Communist and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International" (special committee in report of March 29, 1944).

A leaflet of the Committee to Defend America by Keeping out of War (p. 2), named Robert Morss Lovett as one of the sponsors of the Emergency Peace Mobilization; a letterhead of the same organization, dated August 10, 1940, contained his name in a list of the committee's sponsors. "After Stalin signed his pact with Hitler, the Communist-led Committee to Defend America by Keeping Out of War * * * came forth to oppose the national-defense program, lend-lease, conscription, and other 'war-mongering' efforts." It initiated the American Peace Mobilization (special committee * * * in report dated March 29, 1944).

In 1929 Professor Lovett was a member of the national committee of the International Labor Defense, as shown on a letterhead of that organization dated February 18, 1929; a branch of the ILD in Chicago is named for Robert Morss Lovett (Daily Worker of May 16, 1936, p. 3); he signed a petition of the organization addressed to the Japanese Ambassador (Daily Worker, March 19, 1938, p. 2).

The International Labor Defense has been cited as subversive and Communist, and as the "legal arm of the Communist Party" (Attorney General, press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; and the Congressional Record of September 24, 1942, p. 7686, respectively); the special committee cited the ILD as "essentially the legal defense arm of the Communist Party of the United States" (reports of January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944); the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the ILD as "part of an international network of organizations for the defense of Communist law-breakers" (Rept. 1115 of September 2, 1947).

The Civil Rights Congress was formed in 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations, the International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, and was "dedicated * * * specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" (Rept. 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities); the Attorney Gen-

eral cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948). The Daily Worker of December 15, 1948 (p. 11), reported that Mr. Lovett was one of the sponsors of the Freedom Crusade of the Civil Rights Congress; he was a sponsor of the Bill of Rights conference of the congress which was held in New York City, July 16-17, 1949 (call to the conference, p. 9); he was one of the sponsors of the national conference of the congress which was held in Chicago (Daily Worker, October 21, 1947, p. 5; November 19, 1947, p. 6; Daily People's World of October 28, 1947, p. 4); he was one of the sponsors of the congress' protest of the indictment of the 12 Communist leaders (Daily Worker of December 31, 1948, p. 3). Dr. Lovett was 1 of those who signed the open letter to J. Howard McGrath on behalf of the 4 jailed trustees of the bail fund of the Civil Rights Congress of New York (advertisement in the Washington Evening Star of October 30, 1951, "paid for by contributions of signers"), and he was also a member of a delegation to Attorney General McGrath to secure the release of the 4 trustees (Daily Worker of September 21, 1951, p. 1). He spoke at a free Nelson rally of the Civil Rights Congress, September 19, in Chicago, held in conjunction with the Amnesty Committee for Smith Act Victims (Daily Worker of September 23, 1952, p. 2).

The Daily Worker of December 31, 1951 (p. 3), reported that Robert Morss Lovett would speak at a rally in New York City, January 4, 1952, to "smash the Smith Act"; the Daily People's World of February 27, 1952 (p. 2), named him as a sponsor of an emergency conference dedicated to the defense of Communists arrested under the Smith Act, which conference was to be held in New York City, March 16. Professor Lovett signed a telegram of greeting to Eugene Dennis on his 48th birthday: the greeting was prepared and dispatched by the National Committee To Win Amnesty for Smith Act Victims. (See Daily Worker of August 11, 1952, p. 3.) He signed an appeal to the President of the United States, requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party who were convicted under the Smith Act (Daily Worker, December 10, 1952, p. 4).

Professor Lovett was an advisory editor of Champion magazine, official organ of the Young Communist League (as shown in Champion for August 1936 p. 2); he contributed to the December 1936 issue (p. 6). The Young Communist League has been cited as a subversive, Communist organization which seeks "to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means" (the Attorney General of the United States in press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948).

The Federated Press has been cited as a Communist-controlled organization financed by the American Fund for Public Service and the Robert Marshall Foundation, both principal sources of funds for Communist enterprises (special committee * * * in Rept. 1311 of March 29, 1944). On a letterhead of the Federated Press League dated April 9, 1921, Robert Morss Lovett is named as president. The letter explained that the Federated Press League had been organized for "immediate support" of the Federated Press and contributions were solicited for that purpose.

A letterhead of Friends of the Soviet Union, dated June 28, 1932, named Robert Morss Lovett as contributing editor of Soviet Russia Today; he spoke at a meeting of Friends of the Soviet Union in Chicago in 1930 (Daily Worker, March 17, 1930, p. 1). Friends of the Soviet Union was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948); it was "one of the most open Communist fronts in the United States" whose purpose was "to propagandize for and defend Russia and its system of government" (special committee reports of January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944).

The magazine, Soviet Russia Today, was cited as a Communist-front publication in reports of the special committee and the Committee on Un-American Activities (special committee's reports of June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944; and a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, dated April 26, 1950). With the March 1951 issue, Soviet Russia Today changed its name to New World Review. Mr. Lovett reviewed Margaret Graham's book, Swing Shift, in an article entitled "An American With a World View," in the June 1952 issue of New World Review (p. 61). The Daily Peoples World of February 17, 1953 (p. 7), reported that Professor Lovett contributed an article entitled "Back to John Milton," to the New World Review for February 1953.

Professor Lovett was a national sponsor of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, as shown on their letterhead dated August 2, 1944; he signed a statement of that committee, defending its executive board members (Daily Worker of

October 18, 1948, p. 4). The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948); the Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as a Communist front (Rept. 1311, dated March 29, 1944).

Professor Lovett was a member of the advisory board of both Films for Democracy and Film Audiences for Democracy, as shown in Films for Democracy for April 1939 (p. 2), and Film Survey for June 1939 (p. 4), respectively. Both the Films for Democracy and Film Audiences for Democracy were cited as Communist-front organizations by the special committee in a report dated March 20, 1944.

The Daily Worker of July 1, 1937 (p. 2), revealed that Professor Lovett was one of the sponsors of the Mother (Ella Reeve) Bloor birthday celebration on the occasion of her 75th birthday; the same information appeared in an undated letterhead concerning the anniversary celebration. Mother Ella Reeve Bloor was an outstanding woman Communist leader in this country.

The June 1933 issue of the Struggle Against War (p. 2), named Professor Lovett as a member of the American Committee for Struggle Against War; the same publication, in the August 1933 issue (p. 2), disclosed that he was a member of the arrangements committee for the United States Congress Against War. The American Committee for * * * was cited as a Communist-front organization which was formed in response to directions from a World Congress Against War which was held in Amsterdam in August 1932 under the auspices of the Communist International (from the special committee's report of March 29, 1944).

A letterhead of Russian Reconstruction Farms, Inc., dated March 20, 1926, contains the name of Robert Morss Lovett in a list of members of that organization's advisory board. Russian Reconstruction Farms, Inc., has been cited as a Communist enterprise directed by Harold Ware, son of the well-known Communist, Ella Reeve Bloor (special committee's Rept. 1311 of March 29, 1944).

Professor Lovett was a member of the board of sponsors of the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights (press release of February 23, 1940), cited as a Communist-front organization by the special committee and by the Committee on Un-American Activities (Rept. 1311 of March 29, 1944; and Rept. 1115 of September 2, 1947).

A letterhead of the Non-Partisan Committee for the Reelection of Congressman Vito Marcantonio, dated October 3, 1936, named Robert Morss Lovett as one of the members of that organization, cited as a Communist front in Report 1311 of the special committee.

Robert Morss Lovett was a member of the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners (letterhead dated October 31, 1935), and a member of the National Committee for People's Rights (letterhead of July 13, 1938, and News You Don't Get, dated November 15, 1938). The Attorney General cited both the National Committee for the Defense of * * * and the National Committee for People's Rights as follows: The National Committee for * * * "substantially equivalent to International Labor Defense, legal arm of the Communist Party," which changed its name in "January 1938 to National Committee for People's Rights * * *. No substantial change was made in its setup or functions." The special committee cited both organizations as Communist-front groups. (See Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7686; and the special committee's reports of June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944, respectively.) The Attorney General later cited the National Committee for the Defense of * * * as Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948).

Professor Lovett signed a statement sent to the Assistant Secretary of State, urging him to save anti-Fascist refugees in France; the statement was prepared by the United American Spanish Aid Committee, as shown in the Daily Worker of July 23, 1940 (p. 3). The United American Spanish Aid Committee was one of the organizations set up during 1937 and 1938 when the Communist Party campaigned for the Spanish Loyalist cause (Rept. 1311 of the special committee).

A letterhead of the Refugee Scholarship and Peace Campaign, dated August 3, 1939, contained the name of Robert Morss Lovett in a list of sponsors of that organization, cited as a Communist front by the special committee (report dated March 29, 1944).

The Daily Worker of April 10, 1950 (p. 2), reported that Robert Morss Lovett signed a statement in support of Pablo Neruda, a Chilean Communist, and the Daily People's World of May 12, 1950 (p. 12), named him as having signed a statement on behalf of the Communist leaders, addressed to the United Nations.

He signed a statement on behalf of the so-called "Hollywood Ten" (Daily Worker of May 12, 1950, p. 3); and he also signed a petition to the Supreme Court of the United States for a reconsideration of its refusal to hear the appeal of the Hollywood Ten (advertisement in the Washington Post of May 24, 1950, p. 14). The following reference to the Hollywood Ten appears in the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities released December 31, 1948 (p. 9): "Each of these witnesses refused to affirm or deny membership in the Communist Party, * * *. In each case the committee presented voluminous evidence to show affiliations with Communist organizations and a copy of the witness' Communist Party registration card."

All Our Years, written by Robert Morss Lovett, was recommended by the Worker of December 19, 1948 (p. 10 of the magazine section). The Worker is the Sunday edition of the Communist Daily Worker.

As shown in the Daily Worker of June 9, 1948 (p. 7), Professor Lovett spoke at a meeting in Chicago in opposition to the Mundt anti-Communist bill; he signed a statement to the President of the United States, opposing the McCarran bill (Daily Worker of September 17, 1950, p. 3; September 21, 1950, pp. 1 and 9; and September 24, 1950, pp. 3 and 6). These sources gave his address as Oak Terrace, Minn. The Daily Worker of June 12, 1952 (p. 6), revealed that the Honorable Robert Morss Lovett had requested a new trial for the Rosenbergs and Morton Sobell; the request was sponsored by the National Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case; the Daily Worker of October 15, 1952 (p. 3), reported that he had protested the death sentence imposed upon Julius and Ethel Rosenberg; in this source he was identified as former Governor of the Virgin Islands. The Daily Worker of January 14, 1953 (p. 7), reported that he had protested the death penalty for the Rosenbergs; his photograph appeared in connection with the protest.

On March 12, 1953, the Daily Worker reported (on p. 7) that "Leading Marxists and non-Marxists united in spirited defense of 'The Right to Teach and Learn Marxism' at the recent Ninth Annual Dinner at the Jefferson School of Social Science * * *. Before an audience of 400 guests, including about 100 students of the Jefferson School, speakers from the university campus, the trade-union hall and the most active political battlefronts joined together in denouncing the Smith Act, the McCarran Act, and McCarthyite congressional 'witch hunts' as war-inspired efforts to stifle independent thought; and they all, with varying emphasis, reaffirmed America's need for Marxist teachings.

"Prof. Emeritus Robert Morss Lovett, of the University of Chicago, following an illuminating address on the role of Marxist thought during the past century, electrified his audience by asking everyone to stand in tribute to two famous Marxist leaders of the United States working class—Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and the late Mother Bloor. * * *." The Jefferson School * * * was cited by the Attorney General of the United States as an "adjunct of the Communist Party" (press release dated December 4, 1947); the special committee reported that "at the beginning of the present year (1944), the old Communist Party Workers School and the School for Democracy were merged into the Jefferson School of Social Science" (Rept. 1311 of March 29, 1944).

Elizabeth Gurley Flynn was convicted under the Smith Act on charges of conspiring to overthrow the United States Government by force and violence (Daily Worker of January 22, 1953, p. 1).

INDEX

	Page
Acheson, Mr.	228
Baribaldi	216
Barnes, Joe	183, 235, 236
Barrett, Edward	184
Becher, Johannes R.	206-208
Belden, Jack	217
Bentley, Elizabeth	185
Boerner, Alfred	171, 187, 219
Chambers, Whittaker	185
Churchill, Winston	215
Clucas, Mr.	188, 189
Dudley, Isabelle	232
Dulles, John Foster	189, 199, 208, 218-220
Eckstein, Mr. J. E.	188, 189
Eisenhower, President	205, 211, 220
Engels	215, 216
Epstein, Julius, testimony of	203-212
Figi, Chancellor	179
Fischer, Rutherford	239
Fodor, Mike	239
Frankfurter, Justice	185
Gladstone	216
Grace	233, 234
Green, Gladys Ruth	233
Habe, Hans	205, 206
Harris, Reed	199
Heym, Gertrude (alias Valerie Stone)	243
Heym, Stefan	205-208, 210-212, 243
Hitler	205, 206
Hiss, Alger	185, 186
Hoofnagel	198
Hook, Sidney	239
Hoover, Herbert	216, 217
Hopwood, Avery	226
Humelsine, Mr.	241
Irwin, Ben	172-174, 183, 227, 233, 234
Jacobson, Alfred	240
Kaghan, Theodore	203, 204, 212, 217, 220, 221
Testimony of	171-201, 221-242
Kai-shek, Chiang	215, 216
Kerensky	215, 216
Keyes, Gen. Geoffrey	179, 180, 181, 201
Kierseecke, Heinrich	219
Kilbon, Kenyon	231
Kobad	216
Koestler	239
Kraus, Max	240, 241
Ladue, Col. Lawrence	181, 182, 186, 187
La Fayette	216
Lenin	215, 216
Lovett, Robert Morse	226, 227
Malenkov	187, 188, 194
Martin, Willa Gray	232, 233
Marx	215, 216
McCoy, John	238

Monteconi, Mr.	194, 197
Nachrichten, Salzburger	179
Nicholson, Ralph	238
Peters, Anna	214
Peters, Louisa	214
Reed, Justice	186
Riedel, Dr. John	242
Seghers, Anna	207, 208, 217
Shaw	217
Silone, Ignazio	239
Slocum, John	194-198
Stalin	205, 206, 215
Stone, Shepard	219
Thayer, Charles	208, 209
Tse-tung, Mao	215, 216
Utley, Freda, testimony of	212-221
Wallenberg, Hans	204-210, 239, 240
Wechsler, Mr	240
Weiskopf, F. C.	207, 208
Wilson, Woodrow	216, 217
Wolfe, Mr	195



